CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLICANISM,

IN OPPOSITION TO

FALLACIOUS FEDERALISM;

AS PUBLISHED OCCASIONALLY IN THE

Independent Chronicle,

UNDER

THE SIGNATURE OF

O L D - S O U T H.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A PREFATORY ADDRESS

TO THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES,

NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED.

BY BENJAMIN AUSTIN, JUN.

"OH, that this care might univerſal be,
That all our ſpecies liv'd in harmony!
That the wide world outſtretch'd, in moral aid,
The cradling arm, to ſhelter and to ſhade!
That tender tranſport melted ev'ry ſoul,
And one warm wiſh preſided o'er the whole!
That all th' oppoſing elements of life,
The gales of rage, and hurricanes of ſtrife,
Might ceaſe; and waft our barks with ſilken ſail;
And on life's ocean zephyrs mild prevail!
That mutual paſſions mutual charms might lend,
And each to each be NEIGHBOUR, FATHER, FRIEND!"

BOSTON:
PRINTED FOR ADAMS & RHOADES,
EDITORS OF THE INDEPENDENT CHRONICLE.
1803.

LIBRARY
OCT 3 1964
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

933401

JK
2317
1803
H85

Prefatory Address.

Fellow-Citizens,

THAT the United States, in their political ſituation, connected with all thoſe advantages which reſult from enterpriſe and induſtry, ſtand pre-eminently conſpicuous amid the nations of the world, is a truth readily acknowledged by the contending parties throughout the continent. On this ſubject there is no real controverſy; federaliſts and republicans unite in this one principle, and nothing can be wanting but a ſpirit of reconciliation to promote univerſal harmony.

As Americans, we are all intereſted in the general welfare; we all partake of equal bleſſings, ariſing from one ſource. The conſtitution is the true ark of ſafety, and while we adhere to the principles of its legitimate conſtruction, all will go well.

The government is organized for the happineſs of the whole people; no excluſive privileges are the birth-right of particular individuals; no man has a claim on public patronage; but each citizen, however elevated, muſt depend for his continuance in office, on the ſuffrages of his fellow-citizens, deſignated in ſuch modes as are explicitly pointed out by the conſtitution and laws of the United States.

Who then has a right to arraign the voice of the people, when thus expreſſed? What body of men have the privilege to contemn thoſe, whom the citizens have approbated? Who have a licenſe to calumniate, in terms the moſt opprobrious, thoſe who are placed in the ſeats of government? A free inquiry into national tranſactions, is laudable and patriotic; but when ſcurrility and defamation attend ſuch inquiries, we have reaſon to ſuſpect the integrity of the agents.

The hiſtory of the world cannot produce a parallel, wherein the groſſneſs of abuſe, and the malignity of temper, have been carried to ſuch an unbounded exceſs. The preſent adminiſtration

have been attacked with a virulence, which has nearly exceeded the ingenuity of grammarians to coin words adequate to its import. The whole vocabulary of the Engliſh language, expreſſive of the malignant paſſions, has, within a few years, been exhauſted to defame the reputation of almoſt every republican in the government. The greateſt culprit within Newgate, the moſt abandoned miſcreant that ever made his exit from Tyburn, has been more favoured by his opponents than the Preſident of the United States and thoſe who adhere to his adminiſtration. Decency has been ſacrificed at the ſhrine of federaliſm ; and oftentimes have the libellous paragraphs been ſo baſely defamatory, that a virtuous man felt a conſcious guilt in admitting ſuch obſcenities within his family. Every epithet of ſlander was admitted. Our national character has been ſported with, by men who pretend to reſpect the honour of their country, with a wantonneſs which would diſgrace a tribe of ſavages, or a horde of Hottentots.

Fellow-citizens ! it is unneceſſary to recapitulate in detail the falſehoods, ſcurrility, and malicious defamation, which have been propagated through thoſe proſtituted vehicles, arrogantly ſtiled *federal* preſſes. They are diſgraceful to any organiſed ſociety, more eſpecially to one which excluſively claims the appellation of republican. If we may judge of the diſpoſition of thoſe authors, by their manner of writing, the reign of Roberſpierre would be a millennium in compariſon with the ſanguinary actions of ſuch inveterate calumniators, provided their power was co-extenſive with their malice. If the guillotine was not the weapon of their cruelty, to ſilence all oppoſition, it would not ariſe from motives of lenity ; but impriſonment, fines and perſecutions would be adopted as more adequate to the purpoſes of torture and diſtreſs, by the *lingering poignancy* of the death inflicted.

If theſe men were really deſirous to promote the welfare of their country, would they try every method to excite the hatred of the citizens againſt their conſtituted authorities ? Would they attempt to diſſolve the Union, by raiſing a jealouſy between the reſpective ſtates ? Would they profane the name of WASHINGTON, by urging an attachment to his precepts, while at the ſame time, they were crucifying this patriot on the croſs of anarchy and civil diſſenſion ?

The fact is, theſe people are enemies to the happineſs and proſ-

perity of America ; they are the remnants of that faction, which were well known during our revolution, under the appellation of tories. This party have had the addreſs, like Satan in the garden of Eden, to deceive ſome, whom we delighted to call our *firſt parents*. They tempted them to renounce their primeval ſtate, and attempting to be GODS, they became leſs than men. They loſt their original purity, and by *their fall* threatened to inflict a political curſe on the preſent and future generation. Thank heaven, the guardian angel of America appeared for our deliverance ; and ſince the authors of our misfortunes have been legally diſmiſſed from their ſtations, we truſt, that the happineſs of ſociety is reſerved for the faithful and virtuous citizens. The conſtitution of our country does not make one claſs of men the ſole repreſentatives of our national proſperity, but has reſerved a right in the people, to change them whenever apoſtacy becomes the prominent feature of their adminiſtration.

At this criſis, fellow-citizens, what is the direct path before us ? Will you truſt to them, who are abuſing thoſe who do all in their power to relieve you ? Are you in favour of thoſe who wiſh additional taxes in oppoſition to ſuch who are deſirous to leſſen them ? Do you want an eight per cent. loan, exciſe, ſtamp duties, ſtanding army and ſupernumerary officers, when the government declares there is no occaſion for them ? Are you ſo anxious to pay away your money, that you muſt reprobate the men who tell you they do not require it ? Does the merchant earn his property ſo readily, that he is uneaſy unleſs government is conſtantly draining his coffers ? Do the farmer and tradeſman enjoy ſuch a plenitude, that they require an exciſeman to carry away the ſurplus ? If the executive of the United States pledges himſelf to anſwer all emergencies without theſe ſupplementary aids ; if the ſecretary of the treaſury exhibits a fiſcal ſtatement, proving the practicability of paying off our cumbrous debt, with the revenue ariſing from IMPOST alone, why in the name of common ſenſe are we oppoſed to the experiment ? Depend on it, fellow-citizens, the man who is againſt the repeal of our *exciſe laws*, is not a friend to the people ; he wiſhes to aſſimilate our mode of taxation with the Britiſh, and is afraid, unleſs this ſyſtem of taxation is adopted, he ſhall not ſtand a chance to participate in enjoying thoſe perſonal bleſſings, which ariſe from a multiplicity of offices.

Let us then unite in the ſalutary ſyſtem adopted by the preſent government; let each one endeavour to promote the general harmony, and do all in his power to ſtrengthen an adminiſtration, whoſe object appears concentrated to *leſſen taxes*, and eaſe the citizens from *unneceſſary burdens*. If any government in Europe had adopted ſimilar meaſures, the projectors of ſuch a beneficent plan would receive the plaudits of every honeſt man within the nation. If a miniſter in England had curtailed the taxes of the people in a ſimilar proportion to Preſident Jefferſon, millions of voices would join in hallelujahs to celebrate his patriotic merit.

The foregoing remarks may be thought inconſiſtent with that ſpirit of reconciliation inculcated in the motto of this volume. But in the idea of the author, they perfectly coincide with the eſſentials contained in it. Harmony, peace, and moderation depend on the body of *republican citizens*, acting upon one conſolidated principle in ſupport of the conſtitution and laws of the government. An union of republicans and monarchiſts can never be expected; an union with thoſe who advocate unneceſſary taxes, and thoſe who are oppoſed to them, is chimerical; an union of thoſe, who uſe ſcurrility and defamation, with thoſe who ſubſtantiate their meaſures by reaſon and ſound policy, is reverſing every logical deciſion; an union with friends of order and the revilers of an adminiſtration, which inculcates peace abroad, and harmony at home, is as impoſſible as a cordiality between God and mammon. The union ſought after, depends on the candid deliberation of the well-diſpoſed citizens, whoſe happineſs is involved in the permanency of a wiſe and economical adminiſtration. An union of this kind may be effected; as we have reaſon to think that many honeſt men have been in oppoſition, from the arts and intrigues of ſuch claſſes as are above deſcribed: and we charitably hope, a pre-eminent character, now in retirement, is convinced that he was *deceived* by thoſe who pretended the higheſt friendſhip towards him. We ever wiſh to revere his character for *the part he took during our revolution*; and we pray GOD, that his laſt days may be employed in expoſing thoſe culprits, who pretend to venerate him, while they eulogiſe the man who attempted to blaſt his fame with infamy and reproach.

Taking this ground, the author of the following numbers has conſidered the various ſubjects contemplated. He has noticed

every individual in his *political character*. As private men, he eſtimates them in proportion to their ſocial virtues, and does not wiſh to invalidate whatever may be eſſential to their moral rectitude. He acknowledges to have written with freedom: but the controverſy of the preſent day, as connected with the future happineſs of our common country, demands an unequivocal inveſtigation of public men and meaſures. He is willing to ſtand the teſt of principles; and for this purpoſe only, has he conſented to give *his name* as a voucher for the ſincerity of his obſervations.

The cauſe of *real, undefiled religion*, as inculcated in *the goſpel*, he is ever deſirous to eſpouſe, and if any remarks on its profeſſors may appear pungent, it is for the ſole purpoſe of diſcriminating between piety and hypocriſy: neither would he uncharitably contemn all ſuch men, as differ from him, as hypocrites or apoſtates; yet the ſeverity and indecency with which ſome have replied to his remarks, juſtify him in adminiſtering the *tartar of retaliation*.

He has been particular in ſome of his numbers to appeal to the good ſenſe, and unbiaſſed judgment, of the YOUNG MEN. He has made his addreſs to this valuable claſs of citizens, from the moſt inconteſtible documents; and though he may be thought, by a few of them, to have eſpouſed doctrines ſubverſive of their intereſt, yet he truſts they will, on a candid *re-peruſal* of the ſubject, acquit him from any ſuch deſign. He has furniſhed them with the ſpecific proceedings of the merchants, ſanctioned with names of the higheſt credibility; and he leaves it with the young men to decide on this important queſtion.

If he is wrong in any one particular throughout the ſeveral numbers, he is willing to acknowledge his error; but ſcurrility and defamation will never be conſidered as arguments, either to abandon his principles, or intimidate him from perſeverance. The remarks are ſubmitted to a candid public; and to their tribunal he is ready to ſubmit his plea. Having no ſiniſter views to gratify, if they are acceptable to his fellow-citizens, he is perfectly rewarded for his labours.

The author ſtands on the baſis of the conſtitution; and while he maintains an attitude, which is juſtifiable by this compact, the billingſgate effuſions of a deſperate faction will be unnoticed. If

any man will meet him with his *name*, he is willing to inveſtigate the ſubject, becoming a gentleman and citizen. After this explicit declaration, whoever replies, in abuſive language, in an *anonymous diſguiſe*, will be treated as ſuch a character ought ever to be, with ſilent contempt.

THE

POLITICAL WRITINGS

OF

OLD-SOUTH.

No. I.

ON THE BRITISH TREATY.

THE ſignature of *Old-South* may appear a little ſingular to thoſe who are not acquainted with the proceedings of the town of Boſton, aſſembled at this ancient edifice on the queſtion of the treaty. At a previous meeting, the treaty was univerſally diſapproved, and a petition forwarded to the Preſident on the ſubject. It was therein declared to be injurious to the intereſt of the country, and deſtructive to our commerce. Many weighty objections were made to its ratification, and after the fulleſt inveſtigation of the principles of the report, it was ordered to be ſent to the Preſident by the Selectmen.

About three weeks afterwards, a petition was handed about by particular individuals, to be ſigned by the citizens, urging our Repreſentatives to make the neceſſary appropriations for the fulfilment of the treaty. This meaſure was conſidered as counteracting the former declaration of the town in their corporate capacity; and as undue means were uſed to obtain ſubſcribers, another meeting was called to take the ſenſe of the citizens on the ſubject. During the debates, the ſame objections were ſtated as at the former meeting, and the injurious conſequences of this inſtrument were ſtill held forth in oppoſition to its ratification, and appropriations. The pointed reflections then made on the oppoſers, are freſh in the minds of thoſe who attended, and though the vote was carried againſt them, yet the conſequent diſadvantages we experi-

ence, are proofs of the propriety of the objections then offered. To commemorate this important æra, the signature of *Old-South* is now taken.

As the opposers of the treaty were at that period the objects of the most severe, and ungenerous abuse and censure ; and as their principles were reprobated with all the venom of calumny and defamation, it is but proper to turn the minds of the citizens, into that channel of reflection, as will lead them to judge, " *Whether the sentiments of the opposers, or those of the advocates, were most congenial to the interests of the country :* Whether the predictions of the fallacy of British integrity, in protecting our commerce and respecting our neutrality ; in their professions of friendship, and their cordiality to our seamen, have not in almost every instance been realized : And whether we have not proofs as clear as holy writ to vindicate the assertions then made, that the benefits anticipated by the treaty would soon become as delusive, as the " baseless fabric of a vision."

Let the orators who then pictured in the most glowing strains the blessings we were to enjoy under the mild operation of this instrument, now enumerate the manifold advantages we experience. Let them lay their finger on the document, which gives that ample indemnification to our merchants, for captured property, which they so pleasingly described. Let them relate the honorary marks of respect paid to the American flag. Let them contrast the late orders of the British government, with their rhapsody on British amity, and reciprocal attachments. Let them oppose the whippings, and insults to our seamen, with their pleasing recitals of good fellowship between British and American tars. Let them display the ports of Jamaica, New-Providence, &c. with the expanded wings of the American eagle, pourtrayed as covering the ocean in every quarter of the maritime globe. Or let them consolidate the blessings in the modest demands on the country for the payment of mercantile debts, and the execution of the unfortunate Robbins.—These are subjects, on which we wish to be informed, in order to judge with accuracy between the friends and opposers of the treaty.

The political controversy in this country has been carried on with a degree of personal inveteracy, unbecoming the character either of gentlemen or citizens. Particularly since the adoption of the treaty, every indecent term of reproach has been given to those

who were in the oppoſition. Diſorganizers, traitors, enemies to their country, jacobins, are epithets which have been uſed againſt men, whoſe characters in every point of view have ſtood at leaſt on a par with their calumniators, and in moſt inſtances ſuperior. But we truſt, however, that the time is faſt approaching, when political merit will be duly appreciated; as events will ſoon decide, how far the ſentiments of individuals have been favorable or unfavorable to the happineſs, intereſt, and independence of the country. Our political ſituation cannot long remain a ſpeculative queſtion; it has arrived to that criſis, which muſt diſcloſe the actions of men, and ſtamp on their meaſures the indelible marks of *right* or *wrong*, in characters too legible to be concealed, and too deeply engraved to be eraſed; each individual will ſtand cenſured or approved, according to the part which he has taken, and judgment will be paſſed upon them, not under the influence of party ſpirit, but under that impreſſion which ariſes from deliberation and reflection. This is the teſt to which every honeſt man is willing to ſubmit his conduct, and though he may have borne the contumely of his enemies with a ſilent indignation, yet he muſt feel a conſolation, that the period muſt ſoon arrive, when actions and principles, inſtead of calumny and reproach, will be admitted as the evidences of his integrity. Art and intrigue, threats and defamation, will no longer be wielded as the menacing weapons to deprive a tradeſman of his employment; nor the horrors of a diſtreſſed family be uſed as arguments to oblige a citizen to vote and act contrary to his ſentiments. Thank God! this day of political perſecution is near over; inſolence begins to lower his creſt, and though here and there we ſee its ſhadow, with ſome traits of its former arrogance, yet its ſallow countenance beſpeaks the feebleneſs of its future operations. With great propriety we can exclaim with the Prophet, as it applies to the circumſtances of many, who grew fat and kicked, "How has the gold become dim, and how has the moſt fine gold changed. Their prophets have propheſied *falſely*, and their *prieſts* bear rule by their means—and my people love to *have it ſo*, but what will ye do in the end thereof?"

No. II.

ON THE BRITISH TREATY.

THE tranſactions of this town, on the ſubject of the treaty, were ſo unprecedented, that a mere relation of them at this diſtant period, cannot but carry conviction of the impropriety of our conduct.

Notwithſtanding the *legal meaſure* originally adopted by the town, in bearing their teſtimony againſt the treaty, yet a number of perſons formed themſelves into a "ſelf-created committee," and *early in the morning* patroled the ſtreets, and by unjuſtifiable means obtained a large number of ſubſcribers, in favour of immediate appropriations being made to carry the ſame into operation. Inſtead of calling upon their fellow-citizens in a *legal town-meeting*, they took the advantage of the fears and apprehenſions of individuals, and thereby increaſed their ſubſcription-paper, not by the deliberate determination of the inhabitants, but by that *perſonal influence*, which their pre-eminent ſituation gave them over the judgment of thoſe to whom they applied.

On a queſtion ſo important, and on which the town had previouſly acted, it was incumbent on thoſe gentlemen of the committee, to call another meeting of the inhabitants, that the ſubject might be candidly debated and maturely conſidered :—That the town in its *corporate capacity* might hear the arguments in favour, and in oppoſition to the meaſure :—That each man might be able to judge and act, according to the weight of reaſoning offered on both ſides :—That free diſcuſſion, inſtead of threats and menaces, ſhould be the criterion on which the mind ſhould decide. This mode of conduct would have been fair and candid, and no reflections could afterwards have been thrown on any one, whatever might have been the iſſue of the buſineſs. It would have ſhewn a diſpoſition for reconciliation, and given an opportunity for each citizen to ſtate his objections.

It may here be anſwered, that a town-meeting was called, and that the ſubject was debated in a legal aſſembly of the citizens.—But, after the committee had accompliſhed *their object*, by obtaining twelve or thirteen hundred ſubſcribers, the public mind had by

this measure been so far *pre-engaged*, that it placed the business before the town, in a very different position, than if such a procedure had not taken place. After men had signed to a paper in favour of the treaty, it was too great a challenge on their pride, to expect that they would renounce in public, what they had thus done in private. This whole transaction was, if I may use the expression, *forestalled*, previous to the town-meeting being called; and the advocates for the treaty evidently felt their security in carrying their vote, from the peculiar conduct which they assumed on this occasion. The debates were carried on, with that *hauteur* of self-confidence, as fully evinced, that *they knew* what would be the final issue of the question. Clamour, and other indecencies, so far drowned the voice of the opposers of the treaty, that even the thunder of a Stentor, would have been as feeble in the tumult, as the whispers of an infant. From these circumstances, therefore, the town-meeting was rendered entirely useless, as it respected an *unbiassed investigation* of the subject on which they had assembled; and the whole transaction must, *on cool reflection*, be considered (as it relates to some) as the efforts of an overbearing party, to counteract, by undue means, the legal measures of the town at their previous meeting.

It may be observed by some, that it is unnecessary at this distance of time, to recount the doings of individuals on this occasion, as what they *then* did, cannot *now* be remedied. But, when we reflect, how far political characters have been estimated, by their opinions on this question; what abusive scurrility has been incessantly heaped upon those, who dared to speak their sentiments, —it may not be improper to mention these things, *by way of remembrance*, in order to shew, that however PARTY SPIRIT might at that period gain such an ascendancy, as to injure the reputation of individuals, yet, that the *event* has proved their opponents to be in the wrong. The apprehensions of the inutility of this instrument, and the distrust of its beneficial operation, were the principal causes which originated the opposition to its adoption. The venerable SAMUEL ADAMS declared in his speech to the legislature of Massachusetts, that "it was pregnant with evils;" and President WASHINGTON said also, that "it was pregnant with events." The former with a prophetic spirit, dreaded its consequences, and the latter hesitated as to its salutary effects. Such were the cha-

racters, that halted, and paused over this important instrument; how ungenerous then has been the abuse which those have received, who expressed their doubts, when such sages were thus agitated?

The present situation in which we are placed, is a strong evidence, that the benefits anticipated from the treaty are vain and delusive. The commissioners on the part of the United States have seceded from the claims of the British. This is a proof the demands must have been so unreasonable that Messrs. FITZSIMMONS and SITGREAVES could not justify themselves in acceding to them. Notwithstanding these gentlemen were warm advocates in its favour, yet on an attempt to liquidate the system of settlement, they are obliged to relinquish the business. Notwithstanding the government have made all their necessary appropriations, and submitted the whole transaction to *the friends of the treaty*, yet when they come to act on the subject, the impropriety of the claims and the extent of the demands, are so glaringly improper, they are forced to suspend the negociation. If these gentlemen are confounded (who are so favorably inclined towards the treaty) what must we think of the nature of the claims? If they could not transact the business, who among us can expect to do it? If the British commissioners will persist in opposition to these gentlemen, to whom will they condescend to comply? The objections by these gentlemen must be of the greatest magnitude, otherwise *they would not venture* to derange and suspend so important a business. The treaty is now placed on their shoulders, as it has gone through every department of government, and it rests with them to bring it to a close. They must have strong reasons why they have seceded; the property of the merchants is suspended on their decision; millions now lay in the British courts, waiting the fulfilment of our treaty. Amidst such anxious expectations, our commissioners must be led by arguments the most cogent, to break off from this negociation. We must conclude, when such men *hesitate*, that "the treaty is pregnant with evils," and that they dread its consequences. No small consideration could suffer them to delay a moment; but to secede and disperse, carries in it an appearance of the most alarming nature; or at least, in the words of General WASHINGTON, "it is pregnant with events."

What then, fellow-citizens, shall we say to these things? After

every exertion made by its advocates—after Mr. PICKERING was so ſtrenuous for its ratification, as to declare that all was "thrown into the wind," if it was not effected—after the violent meaſures purſued to intimidate all who were in the oppoſition—after the "ſelf-created committee" in Boſton, had ranſacked, *early in the morning*, every part of the town, and diſturbed the pious citizens in their family devotions—after the abuſe of Meſſrs. GALLATIN, LIVINGSTON and others, for preſuming to offer a reaſon againſt it—after all the huzzas and exultation on ſucceeding in this buſineſs,—is it not ſtrange that when it was left to Meſſrs. FITZSIMMONS and SITGREAVES, (two of its moſt ſtrenuous advocates) the whole ſhould be "thrown into the wind," by them, and that they are the perſons to diſcover its fallacy and deception?

This is a moſt curious circumſtance. What muſt the "ſelf-created committee" in Boſton think of this? If they were ſo irritated at a few obſervations againſt the treaty, what muſt be their opinion of Meſſrs. SITGREAVES and FITZSIMMONS? Theſe gentlemen have ſtruck radically at the buſineſs; they have forgot your zeal in making the appropriations, and if one of the oppoſers had told you in town-meeting, that the treaty would be ſuſpended in its operation, *by its friends*, you would have redoubled your clamours in hiſſing him from the ſanctum ſanctorum of the *Old South*.

Not to purſue, *for the preſent*, this ſubject any further, we cannot but flatter ourſelves, that the characters of men will be duly appreciated, and that Congreſs in their next ſeſſion will call on our commiſſioners *for the reaſons* of their ſeceding. It is a queſtion too intereſting in its nature to be confined within the breaſts of Meſſrs. FITZSIMMONS and SITGREAVES. If government have done their duty, and the "ſelf-created committee" in Boſton have done their duty, why is the buſineſs of the treaty ſuſpended? The wiſdom of the executive, aided by the reſolution of the legiſlature, we truſt, will reconcile theſe ſeeming contradictions.

No. III.

ON THE DANGERS OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.

THE pride of every freeman muſt recoil at the diſgraceful ways and means, taken by thoſe who have the effrontery to claim the ex-

cluſive title of federaliſts, to obtain proſelytes to their meaſures; and the infamous arts practiſed by the tools of this party, cannot but excite the deteſtation of every man, who duly eſtimates the character and dignity of an independent citizen.

Paſſive obedience, not only in principle, but in practice, is the teſt by which the patronage of theſe perſons is to be gained; and without the moſt humiliating ſubſerviency to all their plans, no man is ſecure againſt the utmoſt extent of their perſecution and detraction. Knowing the baſeneſs of their views, they are afraid to truſt to the deliberate and unbiaſſed judgment of the public, but depending altogether on deception, they take every method to check an inveſtigation of their conduct, and by *terror* and *threats* accompliſh thoſe purpoſes, which otherwiſe would be ſtifled in embryo.

This is a picturesque deſcription of a party, who have been aſſiduous in controling the public mind. They have, for a number of years paſt, been active in bearing down every man, who dared to act or even think contrary to their opinion. Every vile calumny has been propagated againſt characters, whoſe independence of mind would not ſuffer themſelves to become the dupes of a junto, whoſe only claim to be obeyed, conſiſted in the peremptory inſolence of their demands, and the audacious arrogance with which they proſecuted their meaſures.

In a government like our own, it is but fair and reaſonable that every citizen ſhould be entitled to act and think independent of the influence of a "*ſelf-created*" body of dictators. But unfortunately the times have produced a ſet of men, who preſume to take a rank above the common level of the people, and becauſe they have acquired, by ſpeculation, uſury, and other *accidental circumſtances*, a larger proportion of property than many of their neighbours, they think they have a right to infringe on the privileges of thoſe, whom they ignominiouſly deſignate as the *lower claſs* of the community.

This ariſtocratical junto cannot however obtain that reverence of character which they are aiming to acquire. The good ſenſe of the citizens will ever appreciate their worth, as the means by which ſome of them have riſen to their preſent elevation, are in ſo many inſtances derogatory to their reputation, that even the

brilliancy of their outside deportment, cannot conceal the blackness of their inward depravity.

For the most part, the measures of this *pretended* federal corps are matured within a "small party," emphatically stiled the Essex Junto; and after they have passed the ordeal of these *choice spirits*, are brought forward with as much solemnity as a young child to be christened. The plans thus adjusted by this primary assembly, are laid before another order, (promiscuously assembled in a well noted place of resort) for *their benediction*, and from thence are transmitted through various channels, consisting of runners, dependants, sycophants, and hirelings, till at length the whole superstructure rises into view, with as much facility as the machinery of an Harlequin exhibition. The different schemes adopted to effect their purposes are worthy notice: one man is threatened, and another coaxed—one is promised a *vast employment* in his business, while another is told that he will be deprived of *the little* he has already got—some are placed on the *visionary list* of preferment, and the high sounding titles of Colonel, Captain, Lieutenant, and Ensign, are sufficiently enchanting to secure a great number on this alluring prospect. Every wheel is set in motion, and even the insignificant, childish bauble of a *cockade*, is exhibited as a token of servile submission to all the dogmatical mandates, and gross impositions, which this supercilious junto are pleased to enjoin. No dependance however is to be placed on their assurances; for, after they have answered their purposes, they leave their votaries a prey to chagrin and disappointment. Neither are they more faithful to each other, for if any accident, arising either from an unfortunate speculation or mercantile transaction, creates the least suspicion, they pursue each other with the most unrelenting severity.

Thus, during the controversy on the treaty, every artful means was practised to intimidate the honest tradesmen. Some of this party had the impudence to threaten an industrious citizen with a deprivation of his whole business. Every little contemptible art was practised to obtain signatures to many of their subscription papers. Boys in their *non-age*, and old men in their *dotage*, were forced to enrol their names, to swell the list of subscribers. They even deceived the President and Congress, in the number exhibited on their scroll; for instead of free and independent citizens, a

great part were obliged to submit to the impoſition, from an apprehenſion of a ſtarving family, rather than from a diſpoſition in favour of a paper the contents of which they held in the utmoſt abhorrence. The names of this Committee, (ſuch as uſed unfair means to obtain ſignatures) ought to be known to the public, and read yearly in our town-meeting, to impreſs on the minds of the people the dangerous tendency of a ſelf-created junto, in impoſing on the fears of the citizens, and in attempting to deceive, by falſe repreſentations, the conſtituted authorities of the United States.

The moſt virulent abuſe was conſtantly offered in the papers under this influence, to all ſuch perſons as refuſed to comply with their arrogant requiſition; and every one was treated with the moſt pointed indignity, who *dared* to expreſs a ſentiment in oppoſition to their ſyſtem of terror.

In juſtice, however, to a few who acted in this buſineſs, we are willing to exerciſe a candour, in believing they undertook it from the pureſt motives, though without maturely conſidering the importance of the ſubject. The difference between ſuch characters, and the *high flying Terroriſts*, is eaſily diſtinguiſhable, and charity draws a veil over their conduct. But, it may with truth be ſaid, that in no inſtance, was the honour of the town, and the liberties of the citizens more groſsly violated than in this tranſaction.

However unpleaſing the recollection of paſt events may be, yet, when we reflect on the nature and tendency of ſuch unjuſtifiable methods, to control the unwary and terrify the timid—how deſtructive to the unbiaſſed exerciſe of freedom and deliberation, when the middling claſſes of citizens are expoſed to the perſonal application of men, whoſe *pecuniary influence* clogs every avenue of inveſtigation—when poverty is made an argument to enforce a compliance with their demands, what more effectual ſyſtem can be adopted to deſtroy that independent ſpirit, which is the baſis of a republican government? If this mode of conduct is permitted with impunity, inſtead of that dignified deportment, which ever characteriſes the tradeſmen of this metropolis, we have reaſon to fear that this valuable body of citizens will ſoon be placed in that degraded ſituation, as to obliterate every trait of their former reſpectability.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, hereafter be jealous of theſe violators of our freedom, and watch with hawk-eyed penetration their future movements, leſt, under the maſk of EXCLUSIVE FEDERALISM,

they may ſubſtantiate a ſyſtem which may give *them* cauſe of exultation, and *you* of grief, " at a future day."

May heaven " infatuate and defeat their councils, abate their pride, aſſuage their malice, and confound their devices !"

No. IV.

MONARCHY AND REPUBLICANISM.

THE preſent conteſt in Europe is not merely as it reſpects France and the combined powers, but as it relates to the great principles of Monarchy and Republicaniſm throughout the world.—This has been openly avowed by the Britiſh miniſtry in the Houſe of Commons. The reſtoration of the monarchy of France, and the ſubverſion of their preſent republican government, are the objects contemplated by the Britiſh government in their preſent operations. It is therefore a *war of principle*, on the iſſue of which depends the happineſs and freedom of mankind, as founded on this baſis.

This being granted, we cannot but view with indignation the man who affects a total indifference as to the ultimate deciſion on ſo important a queſtion. It has of late become very faſhionable to reprobate both France and Britain, particularly among thoſe who ſtile themſelves *Moderates*. How often do we hear ſuch characters exclaim, " *Let the contending powers fight on, it is of no conſequence to America which of them proves victorious.*" This is a fatal miſtake—it is of importance to the United States whether the principles of Monarchy ſhould prevail over thoſe of Republicaniſm, as the future proſperity of this country is involved in the controverſy. If the republic of France ſhould be ſubverted, can it be ſuppoſed that the republic of America would long ſurvive the cataſtrophe ? If England conceives it neceſſary to exterminate in France a ſyſtem of government founded on the baſis of republicaniſm, is it probable they would view the ſame principles prevailing in America, without jealouſy and diſtruſt ? If they have involved themſelves in a debt of millions to carry on a *monarchic cruſade* in Europe, can we ſuppoſe they would ſet down quietly and obſerve with an eye of compla-

cency, the riſing glory of the *American Republic?* If it is a war of principle, will they ſuffer the leaſt ſpark of Republicaniſm to remain unextinguiſhed; or rather, after having annihilated the flame in Europe, will they not exert their invigorated energies to obliterate every trait in America, which bears its image or ſuperſcription? Would the Monarch of France and the King of England ever be reconciled to the preſent eſtabliſhment of *our government*, when the principles of our revolution had rouſed the ſubjects of the former to *dethrone his predeceſſor*, and obliged the latter to acknowledge our ſovereignty and independence? Depend on it, AMERICA WILL BE VIEWED AS THE HOT-BED OF SEDITION, and the combined Monarchs would conſider their work but half completed, while they ſuffered the ſeeds to flouriſh within the climate of the United States. The obligation under which Britain would lay France, (if Monarchy ſhould again be reſtored) would ever make her ſubſervient to the views of England, and the hatred of Britain would be proſecuted *againſt us*, with the additional weight of France to haſten our deſtruction. The power of the Britiſh government would be encreaſed in proportion to the ſtrength of France, and America would be obliged to ſtand alone in oppoſition to their combined efforts. France, inſtead of ſupporting our independence, would become an ally with Britain to annihilate it.

By obſerving the various publications in this country, during the European controverſy, it is clear that many perſons among ourſelves have anticipated the *ſucceſſes of the coalition* as introductory to a monarchical and ariſtocratical ſyſtem in America. For theſe purpoſes the "Diſcourſes on Davila" ſeem fully calculated. The pageantry of Royalty has been held up with a reverence, ſolely intended to recommend this form to our approbation. Numerous writers have openly advocated this mode of government, and many individuals, without heſitation, have avowed their ſentiments in favor of its adoption. The newſpapers under the direction of this party, have been more aſſiduous to propagate the ſucceſſes of the combined powers, than even the Royal Gazette of London; and the obſervations which accompanied their "glorious news" were generally fraught with invectives againſt Republicaniſm and encomiums on Monarchy. It muſt be evident, by retracing the publications which have appeared within twelve months paſt, that the expectations of a certain junto in this country

were highly elated at the proſpect of a total annihilation of Republicaniſm in Europe, and fondly anticipated its fall within the United States. Though ſome of them have not had the temerity to declare openly in favor of a *King and Nobility*, yet they have been deſirous ſo to extend the powers of the Executive, and contract thoſe of the Legiſlative, that the difference between the Britiſh government and our own would be only nominal.

From all theſe circumſtances the concluſion is fairly drawn, that the principle of *Monarchy* and *Republicaniſm* is involved in the controverſy between France and the combined powers. Where then is the *American* who can view with indifference the ultimate deciſion of ſo intereſting a queſtion? Can thoſe who fought and bled to acquire thoſe ineſtimable privileges, which are the baſis of a Republican Conſtitution, behold with frigid apathy the contending armies in Europe, or expreſs an unconcerned "*impartiality*" whether victory is more propitious to one ſide than to the other? Would it be pleaſing to obſerve the ſtandard of Monarchy erected on the ruins of the Baſtile, and millions of unhappy victims falling ſacrifices to the vengeance of an incenſed deſpot, and a numerous body of enraged nobility and bloody prieſts? After contending againſt the combined exertions of nearly all Europe; after diſplaying the moſt brilliant exploits of heroiſm and bravery, againſt the mercenary banditti of Britiſh hirelings, is it poſſible that any *American* can feel a lukewarm indifference, whether the barbarous Suwarrow or the humane Bonaparte ſhould reap the laurels of the controverſy? whether Maſſena ſhould grace the triumphs of this ſavage, or lead *him*, bound in chains, as a ſpectacle of horror and deteſtation?

Yes, fellow-citizens, there are ſome who call themſelves *Americans*, who have anticipated the pleaſing idea that Bonaparte would ere long be in irons, and Suwarrow drove in a triumphal car through the ſtreets of Paris. How often have our papers been diſgraced with eulogies on this beaſt of prey. Even the feſtive board has reſounded in approving plaudits at the name of a monſter, whoſe character is ſtained with the blood of helpleſs matrons and weeping infants. The ghoſts of murdered innocents, it might have been expected on ſuch occaſions, would have ſtalked before the inhuman wretch who applauded this aſſaſſin, and daſhed the glaſs from the trembling hand of him, who thus dared to pro-

ſane their memory and ſmile over their tombs. But however diſcordant it may be to the feelings of the human heart, to obſerve even a bacchanalian in his cups giving ſuch evidences of depravity, yet the pain is increaſed tenfold in obſerving the *fair daughters* of America admitting the name of this demoniac to deſignate any ornament of their attire. The *name* of SUWARROW, is more naturally attached to a DAGGER and a POIGNARD, than to a lady's head-dreſs. It may alſo be a deſirable toaſt within a banditti of robbers; and the hall of Pandæmonium (during the carouſals of the infernals) might with propriety reſound with the name of a wretch, whoſe wickedneſs gives him a claim to diſpute precedency even with BELZEBUB. Civilization is become too refined to venerate any circle, that admits this beaſt of prey among the characters they celebrate.

It is natural, fellow-citizens, that the enemies of our revolution ſhould mourn at the victories of the French republic. The old ſpirit of '75 ſtill corrodes their boſoms; and they yet feel that reſentment againſt the *name of a Frenchman*, which boiled in their breaſts when they were fighting with Waſhington againſt the armies of Britain. Theſe men, would *then* have ſtabbed the immortal Waſhington with as much ſatisfaction as they would now ſacrifice Bonaparte. *Monarchy* is their object, and whoever ſtands in the path which leads to the goal, muſt expect the utmoſt vengeance of their diſpleaſure. Thank heaven, the ſnare is broken, and we have eſcaped!

No. V.

ON WASHINGTON'S LEGACY.

IT is remarkable, that the "legacy" (ſo called) of Gen. WASHINGTON, ſhould be recommended to the peruſal of the citizens, by thoſe who act ſo contrary to the advice contained in that publication, and who advocate meaſures in direct oppoſition to the principles which he recommends.

The prominent features of this farewel Addreſs, are conſpicuous in three important points----1ſt, UNION of the States. This

is considered by him so essential that he thus expresses himself: "We have reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavour to *weaken* its bands." The second is, his disapprobation of MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, which, he declares, "under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to *republican liberty*." The 3d is, ECONOMY IN PUBLIC EXPENDITURES; "not throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear." These are the cardinal points, on which our deceased friend emphatically places the happiness, prosperity, and independence of the United States.

In order, therefore, to shew the propriety of the *medium* through which the "legacy of Gen. Washington" is recommended, we are led to examine the sentiments inculcated by those, who now invoke the citizens to a consideration of the subject. For a number of years past, the writers in those papers have continued in one constant strain of invective against some of the most important States in the Union. Every term of reproach, every epithet of abhorrence, every species of calumny and detraction, have been heaped upon them. In many of those papers (especially in Connecticut) the question of separation between the Northern and Southern States has been seriously and vehemently agitated. The great coalition of the federal government has been indecently compared to "a sow with a litter of pigs," and the sovereignty of each individual State has been considered as a MONSTER, which ought to be execrated. The people, in their elective capacity, have been burlesqued, as an uninformed, ignorant banditti, and their votes stigmatized with the odious appellation of "dirty pieces of paper." The subversion of our Constitution has been contemplated by *an Hereditary President and Senate*, and the UNION of the States has been threatened by propositions from men *high in office*, to alter the fundamental principles of the federal government. Sentiments of this nature have been industriously propagated by some, who now recommend to our perusal the Legacy of our deceased WASHINGTON; and, while they pretend to revere his memory and follow his precepts, are endeavouring to accomplish measures to convulse and agonize the UNION of the American Confederation. How inconsistent then is the conduct of such persons, with the advice given in the address?---This party have ever been desirous to seek shelter

under the wing of General Washington, and on all occasions are making an insidious use of his fame to accomplish their purposes. They pretend to be his friends; but while they affect a friendship for him, they are assiduous to counteract every beneficent system which he recommends. *Union of the States* was with him an object of the highest magnitude: but disunion, and even separation, would be the result of their projects. *He* considers the dignity of the States as harmonizing in their *individual capacity*; while those persons view them as a menial group, descriptive only by the sordid simile of a "litter of pigs." Can such people be considered in unison with Washington?

As a further proof of the disposition of this party, in opposition to the Union of the States, is the abuse we daily observe in particular papers offered to the states of Pennsylvania, Virginia and Kentucky. The indecent reflections so constantly bestowed on them, *for an exercise of their own sovereignty*, are calculated to engender a spirit of animosity, highly prejudicial to that "Union" recommended by General Washington. Can the spirit of patriotism influence those, who are endeavouring to excite the most malignant passions and thereby raise a jealousy and distrust between the respective states?—Such persons have had the audacity to stigmatize the majority of the people of those governments, as disorganizers, enemies to order, and a banditti of unprincipled foreigners. This kind of language is solely calculated, to destroy every principle of cordiality, and, no doubt, is intended by a British faction to dissolve that amity so essential to the happiness and prosperity of the United States. Governor M'Kean and Governor Monroe, have been treated with the utmost scurrility; every infamous epithet has been used, to injure and depreciate their reputation. These respectable States have been held up as the hot-bed of sedition, and we daily see the grossest reflections upon the civil and moral character of their supreme magistrates.—What can be the result of all this virulence and defamation? Will it not bring on public and private animosity? Will it not weaken that "UNION," which General Washington considers as the bands of our strength and security?—We must certainly admit these States to equal rights with ourselves; how irritating then must it be to the citizens, to find themselves calumniated as the most detestable of mankind, because they have chosen to exercise their privileges in

the choice of a Governor? We have never found them *cenſuring us* for our choice; and none but thoſe, who conſtitute a *diſorganizing party* (falſely ſtyling themſelves federaliſts) would now have the effrontery to propagate their indecencies, unleſs with a view, to effect the wicked and deteſtable purpoſes of diſſolving the Union, and counteracting the object, ſo ſeriouſly contemplated in the legacy of the beloved Waſhington.

Fellow-Citizens—in all my former publications, I have endeavoured to lay before you FACTS, in order that you may draw fair concluſions. Impoſition has too long been a weapon, ſucceſsfully wielded by thoſe, who are emphatically deſignated as *a faction*, acting under the immediate control of a Junto. Such perſons are now ſhedding their crocodile tears over the tomb of Waſhington. They are laviſh in their encomiums on his virtues and patriotiſm; they are recommending his legacy to be read ſo loud, as that thoſe on the houſe top may hear it. But in order to try their *faith, by their works*, examine critically their conduct, and you will ſoon diſcover the hollow voice of diſſimulation, and fraud. While Waſhington cries "UNION," they are vociferous for *diſſenſion*. While he endeavours to draw the bands of friendſhip cloſer, they are aſſiduous to diſſolve every link which connects the federal chain. While Waſhington recommends peace at home, they are kindling the flame of inteſtine diſcord, and doing all in their power to create an animoſity little ſhort of a civil war, between the northern and ſouthern States. The meaſures taken by them, may, ſooner than we are aware, produce the dreaded evil. Can we expect that Pennſylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky will calmly obſerve the indignities offered to them? Will they bear with complacency the ſcurrilous language, and odious epithets, applied to their legal proceedings, in many of our papers? Will not ſuch reiterated abuſe ſerve to alienate every affectionate attachment, and in time produce that rancour of diſpoſition, which threatens the moſt ſerious conſequences? Such an event would be pleaſing to this invetcrate faction, as they view themſelves reduced to the laſt ſtage of deſperation; and, as they find that the European controverſy is likely to terminate in favour of republicaniſm, their laſt reſource is, to ſow diſſenſion between the reſpective States. Abuſe and ſcurrility are their weapons of warfare, and ſcreened by a hypocritical avow-

al of their attachment to the deceaſed Waſhington, they prowl like wolves in ſheep's clothing, to take an advantage of every occurrence that ariſes. How many of theſe modern patriots, who now diſplay their inſignia of grief for the death of the hero of Mount Vernon, would, in the days of our revolutionary troubles, have rejoiced to ſee him agonizing on the heights of Bunker-Hill, and expiring in the arms of Warren?

Recapitulation and reflection are ſtrong antidotes to their treachery.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, while reading the "Legacy of Waſhington," conſider it as an inſtrument of denunciation againſt the arts and ſtratagems of theſe pretended eulogizers of his memory. They are attempting to make uſe of his name to deſtroy every republican principle which he advocated. They are deſirous, under the appellation of Waſhington's friends, to unite us with that nation, in oppoſition to which, our lately departed hero, by the command of Congreſs, arrayed the armies of America.

If Britain had ſucceeded, the amiable citizen, whom we now deplore, inſtead of being reſpectably depoſited on the ſhores of the Potomack, would have been elevated (in company with the proſcribed Hancock and Adams) as an object of deriſion within the purlieus of Temple Bar. Let us contemplate his virtues at the *trying period of our revolution*, and let us impreſs this TRUTH on the RISING GENERATION, that the man who wiſhes to ally us with *Britain*, cannot be a friend to Waſhington. We never can eſteem thoſe, who aimed a dagger at his breaſt.

May the tomb of this beloved Patriot be ſprinkled with the tears of the VIRTUOUS Americans, and may it never be polluted by thoſe, who would willingly have ſhed his blood at the times which "TRIED MEN'S SOULS"!

The other points enumerated will be conſidered in future papers.

No. VI.

ON WASHINGTON'S LEGACY.

ILLUSTRIOUS WASHINGTON! the REPUBLICAN CITIZENS of *America* celebrate thy virtues, not in ſtrains of hypocritical

adulation, nor in the humble attitude of venal ſycophants, but we eulogize thy memory in thoſe ſublime accents of veneration which are becoming freemen, when commemorating the glorious actions of their departed patriots. While performing this duty, we do not call to our aid a group of menial flatterers, whoſe diſſimulation cannot reflect any honour on thy character; for as thou acquiredſt thy reputation in the days which "tried men's ſouls," and *in oppoſition to their malevolence*, we diſown their perfidious friendſhip, and claim the *excluſive privilege* of expreſſing the agonies of our ſorrow; and with the ſolemnity of *real mourning* moſt ſincerely weep over thy grave. When the enemies of the American revolution exultingly anticipated thy fall, and rejoiced at thoſe diſaſters which like daggers goaded thy boſom; when the faithful band of *American Soldiers*, in concert with the troops of an allied nation, were ſuffering thoſe hardſhips and toils which peculiarly attended the American camp; when our cities were in flames, and the diſtreſſed inhabitants drove from their dwellings; when every face turned pale, and "every man's hand was upon his thigh;" at theſe excruciating periods of public calamity, the citizens who now lament thy exit were anxiouſly ſolicitous for thy ſafety, and with fervent devotion offered up their prayers to heaven, for the conſummation of *thy glory*, and the *peace*, *happineſs* and INDEPENDENCE of our country. While thus extolling thy pre-eminent virtues, we cannot but entwine the laurel on thy brow, and tears of grief which now flow on this ſorrowful occaſion, are thoſe ſpontaneous effuſions of the heart, which will forever embalm thy memory, and tranſmit thy name in honourable remembrance to future generations.

I ſhall now, fellow-citizens, as propoſed in my laſt, purſue the ſubject, by conſidering the other important point contained in the "Legacy" of our deceaſed friend. "OVERGROWN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS (he ſays) under *any form of government*, are inauſpicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as PARTICULARLY HOSTILE TO REPUBLICAN LIBERTY." The principles of General WASHINGTON on the various ſubjects enumerated in his addreſs, are ſo diametrically oppoſed to the conduct of many who now recommend it to public peruſal, that we candidly ſuppoſe they are convinced of their former error, and are now willing to make *an atonement* for their numberleſs faults, by becoming proſelytes to his ſentiments. Military eſtabliſhments have often been advocated in

the very papers which now eulogize this performance. They have gone so far as to hold them essential to the security of Republican Liberty. How are we then lost in wonder, when this sage patriot is reprobating military establishments in the most pointed terms, to hear men, who pretend to extol his political talents, recommending for our adoption, such pernicious institutions?----His expressions are as strong as words can render them. He describes these establishments as inauspicious to every form of government, but emphatically declares them so to "REPUBLICAN LIBERTY." These were the sublime sentiments of our beloved WASHINGTON----sentiments which ought to be wrote in letters of gold, and placed in every public department of the federal and state governments----sentiments which do honour to the man who has filled the office of supreme executive in a free, sovereign, and independent Republic----sentiments which should be taught to our children, and become lessons within our colleges, academies, public schools, and every seminary of education. They are so sublime, that even our pulpits should resound with those pathetic strains. After this exalted declaration, where is the man who pretends to revere the precepts of WASHINGTON, or considers his address as the legacy of a dying friend, who can come forward in support of an establishment DENOUNCED by him, as subversive of the happiness and freedom of his country?

Illustrious shade! may thy warning voice be heard from thy grave, and may the fatal tendency of mercenary military establishments be as deeply impressed on our minds, as thy innumerable virtues are on the tablet of our hearts. And as thou obtainedst thy glorious and honorable reputation in *defence of a republican system of government*, in opposition to a monarchical, may the citizens of America ever express their confidence in thy friendship, and their gratitude for thy inflexibility, by deprecating establishments which you have expressly declared are "inauspicious to liberty."

The dreaded consequences of Standing Armies are too deeply impressed on the minds of our fellow citizens, to require the labours of declamation to enforce an abhorrence to their introduction. The wounds are scarcely closed which were inflicted by the soldiery of Britain, and the sighs of the widow, and the tears of the fatherless are still expressive of their baneful tendency during their residence in America. Hancock, Warren, Thacher, &c. in

their orations on the fifth of March, have depictured the conflagrations, maſſacres, depredations, and violence committed in all ages by a mercenary military force, and have deſcribed it as a ſure precurſor to the extermination of every veſtige which adorns and dignifies human nature in a ſtate of ſociety.----They declared "that it was the moſt ſucceſsful engine ever wielded by tyrants, and that it was impoſſible the kings of England ſhould acquire ſuch exorbitant power, had they not a ſtanding army to enforce their commands----and that, with the officers of this army, they had bribed men to ſacrifice the rights of their country."----Such are the opinions of the patriots of our country; and yet we daily ſee in our public papers advocates for meaſures which tend to the introduction of this MONSTER, "whoſe ſupport is plunder, whoſe nutriment is carnage, and whoſe paſtime is to inflict human wretchedneſs." I aſk you, my fellow-citizens, whoſe habitations have been conſumed by the ſtanding armies of George the 3d, and whoſe lives have been jeopardied by the mandates of an inſulting leader of a ſtill more infuriated band of ſoldiery, whether you can now view a military eſtabliſhment with cordial complacency? I appeal to you, who have experienced "Britiſh generoſity in nakedneſs and hunger," their freedom in guard-ſhips, "and their tenderneſs in ſtripes, and at the end of their ſabres." Speak, fellow-citizens, ſuch of you as felt the vengeance of this ſyſtem of terror, and were anxiouſly ſolicitous for the event, while ſome *miſcreant refugees* were even hardening the heart of the Britiſh Pharoah, and urging him during our revolutionary warfare, "to make peace with Americans only at the point of the bayonet." If there are any who favour the doctrine of ſtanding armies, I will reply to them, not only in the words of WASHINGTON, "that they are inauſpicious to liberty," but enforce even this cautionary ſentiment in the language of the immortal WARREN, "Our fathers look from their celeſtial ſeats with ſmiling approbation on their ſons, who boldly ſtand forth in the cauſe of freedom----but ſternly frown upon the inhuman miſcreant, who, to ſecure the *loaves and fiſhes* to himſelf, would breed a ſerpent to deſtroy his children." Principles are permanent, time cannot make that wrong which was originally right, and however an Eſſex faction, a ſelf-created junto (falſely ſtyling themſelves federal), a Peter Porcupine, a group of mercenary editors, apoſtate whigs, and a remnant of old and young tories

may wiſh for the eſtabliſhment of a ſtanding army, yet we truſt, that the patriotiſm of the Legiſlative and Executive authorities of the United States will annihilate in embryo, every eſtabliſhment which " is hoſtile to republican liberty." As friends to the beloved WASHINGTON, they will never render permanent thoſe inſtitutions, which, " *under any form of government*," he declares to be " inauſpicious to the rights of the citizens." While we read " *his Legacy*," thus denouncing military eſtabliſhments, every drum we hear beat, and every cannon we hear fired from a mercenary corps, we muſt conſider as his voice ſpeaking from his tomb, to check the evil from increaſing. In addition to his authortiy, we can alſo quote the Preſident of the United States, who in the rapturous ſtrain of ejaculation, " thanked heaven that in America there was no STANDING ARMY."

" What our enemies ſo ardently wiſh, muſt be our bane : what they dread muſt be its antidote."----Our enemies are deſirous for a permanent military eſtabliſhment, but Waſhington ſays nay, as it it deſtructive to *Republican Liberty*. HANCOCK, WARREN, and THACHER entered their ſolemn proteſt againſt the meaſure ; " from *ſmall beginnings* (ſays the latter) and *under ſpecious pretences*, princes will raiſe a ſtanding military force, the moſt ſucceſsful engine ever yet wielded by the hand of lawleſs domination." From ſuch authorities, compoſed of worthies both in *Church* and *State*, we have reaſon to dread the MONSTER as " concealing a dagger," under whatever form he preſents himſelf. Let us ever be aware, " that the tiger crouches before he leaps." Military eſtabliſhments are too terrific to raiſe their broad creſt on their firſt introduction, but they imperceptibly inſtil their poiſon, till at length they bring on the political ruin of mankind, as univerſal as the moral depravity by Satan in the garden of Eden. The advocates of the meaſure ſoothe us by ſaying, " we ſhall not ſurely die :" but depend upon it, if we partake of its pernicious fruit, we involve ourſelves and poſterity in remedileſs ruin.

No. VII.

ON WASHINGTON'S LEGACY.

ECONOMY in public Expenditures, is another ſtrong trait in the adviſory addreſs of the departed Waſhington—" not throwing upon poſterity the burthen which we ourſelves ought to bear."

It has often been urged by the friends of monarchy, that a public debt is a public bleſſing. Upon this principle it has always been an object in this form of government, to encreaſe the patronage of the Executive, by creating an artificial ſpecies of property, and thereby eſtabliſhing in the hands of a few, a ſtrong monied intereſt in the community, which on all occaſions ſtand ready to ſupport every miniſterial meaſure, however injurious to the general happineſs of the people. This policy has been aſſiduouſly purſued by the Britiſh nation, and from the multiplicity of deſcriptive evidences of public debt, it has become a ſcience ſo intricate in its various labyrinths, that a man in England is obliged to have recourſe to a ſtock-jobbing negociator, to know the value of the reſpective denomination of funds. By this infamous practice, the value of property is as intricate, to be accurately aſcertained, as a queſtion in law, and a few ſharpers within the ſtock exchange, (after practiſing a few legerdemain tricks under the appellation of bulls and bears,) ſettle the value of every ſpecies of paper currency throughout the kingdom. Neither is there any appeal from their deciſion; as a leading ſtockbroker is as peremptory in fixing the public eſtimation of 3 per cent. 6 per cent. conſols, &c. as the Chief Judge of the Court of King's Bench in determining a judicial controverſy. Every man in the kingdom, who holds any paper evidences of public debt, muſt ſubmit to the arbitrary verdict of a licenſed body of ſharpers, who regularly aſſemble between the hours of one and three, to fix the value of hundreds of millions of property, diſperſed over the whole nation in the poſſeſſion of individuals. The ſyſtem of finance has become ſo ſublimated in England, that it is principally conducted under the control of the miniſtry. Stocks riſe and fall as directed from the office of the Premier—when they are low, the miniſtry buy in, and when they are high, the miniſtry ſell out. Conſequently on

the report of bad news, the government take the advantage of the public diſtruſt, and enable *their purchaſers* to lay in a conſiderable ſtock, in order to furniſh themſelves with the means to proſecute meaſures to carry on their further projects. In ſhort, the funds of England are nothing but a pantomimic exhibition—it is a kind of magic, which thoſe behind the curtain are playing upon the credulity and fears of the people; the *propria perſonæ* are a band of choſen Iſraelites, the real deſcendants from the money-changers in Jeruſalem, who of old were driven out of the Temple; the Britiſh miniſter is the manager, and the whole ſcenery is under his direction; the audience are a group of dupes, who view with amazement the dexterous workings of the machinery, and laugh and ſtare at the raree-ſhows which ariſe amidſt the gambols of Harlequin, in the character of bank directors. Thus will they continue to amuſe the public, till the drama cloſes, the curtain drops, and the whole farce concludes with *exeunt omnes*; the play will be hiſſed, and the actors driven from the ſtage.

Notwithſtanding this immenſe bubble originates from an imaginary property, created from a paper ſyſtem (the *principal* of which is never contemplated to be paid), yet the taxes for the diſcharge of the intereſt are ponderous grievances, which fall annually with an increaſing preſſure upon the moſt induſtrious part of the people. The farmer, merchant, tradeſman, manufacturer, and labourer are all ſubject to the heavieſt impoſitions to maintain in idleneſs a ſet of ſtock jobbers, who (in league with the miniſtry) are contriving to increaſe the public debt by a ſham appearance of voluntary loans. The pretended national reſources in reality are nothing more than a body of uſurious Jews and ſwindling ſtock-jobbers depoſiting in the treaſury their old notes, and taking a new emiſſion, with additional *douceurs*, in conſideration for their *diſintereſted* patriotiſm. The riches of the Britiſh nation are entirely ideal, and the whole art of public credit conſiſts in the ingenuity of the juggle in ſhifting the denomination of paper. The tricks on Tower-Hill, and thoſe at the office of the exchequer, are nearly parallel; as the man who ſwallows pins, ribbons, and fire-brands, to amuſe the rabble and pick their pockets, accompliſhes his wonderful projects equally as ſatisfactory to the gaping croud, as the Premier in creating new debts to pay old ones, or *raiſing* the national credit by the *ſinking* fund.

Aware of this deſtructive and deceptive ſyſtem, which involves a community in general diſtreſs, our deceaſed WASHINGTON impreſſes on the public mind the neceſſity of *economy*, "not throwing on poſterity a burthen which we ourſelves ought to bear." The debt of the United States, during our revolutionary war, unavoidably threw upon us a weight which requires a large proportion of our reſources honorably to diſcharge. Even this burthen ought to be ſo far leſſened, as not to bear too hard upon poſterity. But the immenſe debts ſince contracted have become a ponderous load, which may hereafter involve future generations in perplexity and trouble. The ſyſtem, adopted by the United States, has introduced a kind of financering policy in a great degree ſimilar to that practiſed in England. It was ſo managed, that the moſt undeſerving citizens acquired the principal part of the property which originally belonged to the American veteran army. The intricacy of the ſyſtem gave the whole advantage to a combined clan of harpies, and while the decrepid ſoldier was feebly halting from door to door, and exchanging his hard-earned notes for the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, a ſet of ſharpers ſprang into exiſtence, and by ſtratagem and deception at length reſuſcitated the expiring property from 2/6 to 20/. Though at the preſent period it may be proper to throw a veil over this part of our conduct, yet the immenſe debt ſince contracted, and the exceſſive expenſes and official commiſſions attached to particular departments, come within the advice recommended by General Waſhington, "not to throw a burthen on poſterity."

The amount of debt now exiſting, and for which funds muſt be eſtabliſhed to diſcharge the intereſt, ought to be accurately laid before the public, in order that every citizen may know the real ſtate of expenditures, and the reſources from whence they are to be cancelled. This is an important ſubject for conſideration. By this ſtatement, we can judge of our ability to ſupport a navy, and army. It may be flattering to our pride to talk of twenty or thirty ſhips of the line, and to contemplate a ſtanding army; but, we ſhould firſt ſit down and COUNT THE COST, before we proſecute the meaſure. It may be pleaſing to a number of families to have their children provided for in the army and navy. It may gratify the vanity of thoſe, who, from indolence, are unwilling to labour in their occupation, to be clothed and fed by the public bounty.

Such perſons may feel elated, when enjoying the luxuries of life at the expenſe of the community; but the queſtion naturally returns, Are we not, by proſecuting this ſyſtem, counteracting the advice of Waſhington, "by throwing upon poſterity the burthen which we ourſelves ought to bear"? Would it be ſatisfactory to poſterity, when they find the weight of taxes increaſing, to be told that we had raiſed, during a time of peace and when the militia were in the moſt reſpectable ſituation, a ſtanding body of troops? Or would it be any apology if we ſhould relate to them how many individuals, who had become deſtitute of other means of ſupport, were clothed in fine linen and fared ſumptuouſly every day? Theſe narrations may *now* be agreeable and pleaſant to thoſe who enjoy the bleſſings of ſuch eſtabliſhments; but a heavy tax-bill, to pay the reckoning, would be viewed with an ill grace, and probably lead poſterity to *cenſure* rather than *applaud* their predeceſſors. Poſterity will be able to judge of men and meaſures through an accurate medium. Characters will be dignified, not with the falſe gloſs of flattery, but upon the ſubſtantial ground of merit. How far the actions of men have been meritorious will at thoſe periods fully appear, and the voice of ſycophancy and venal adoration will be ſilenced by deliberate reflection and mature reaſon. Time is the ordeal through which all characters paſs: though ſlow it is ſure; and the man, who places his fame within the page of hiſtory, muſt ſtand only as a *candidate*, till every part of his conduct has revolved round its axis.

The ſublime ſentiments of Waſhington, in his farewel addreſs, by recommending "*union*" and "*economy*," and reprobating "*military eſtabliſhments*," are evidences of paternal affection, which highly recommend him to the love and veneration of his fellow-citizens. His Legacy, under theſe reſpective heads, contains ſuch an ample field for the exerciſe of every patriotic virtue, that, while we reverence *his* character, we cannot but anathematize a faction who are endeavouring to *diſunite* the States—are in favour of a standing army—and, by their extravagance in all public expenditures, are deſirous "*to throw a burthen on poſterity*," ſimilar to the deſtructive ſyſtem of taxation which hangs like a mill-ſtone round the necks of the unhappy Iriſh, and the induſtrious part of the Britiſh nation. May God Almighty impreſs on the minds of "the people" theſe important truths!

No VIII.

ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

AS Washington is now consigned to the solemn mansions of the dead, with all those honours which his pre-eminent virtues demanded, and the public mind is restored to its primitive calmness and composure; even under this heavy dispensation of Providence, a few reflections on the Eulogies which have been pronounced on his character, it is presumed, will not be considered as unworthy notice.

The first which claims our attention is delivered by Mr. Ames. This gentleman was appointed by the *Legislature of Massachusetts*, "to commemorate the sublime virtues of that eminent defender, guardian, and father of his country, that benefactor of mankind, General George Washington." Before so respectable an audience, on so sublime and *extensive* a subject, and before a government which had so sensibly felt (during our revolutionary war) the salutary influence of his military prowess, we could not have expected that the Orator would have attempted to weaken the reputation of the Hero of Mount Vernon in the character of a soldier, by saying, that "great Generals have arisen in all ages of the world, and perhaps *most* in those of *despotism* and *darkness*----In times of *violence* and *convulsion*, they rise, by the force of the whirlwind, high enough to ride in it, and direct the storm----Like meteors, they glare in the black clouds with splendor, that, while it dazzles and *terrifies*, makes nothing visible, but the darkness." How far the Orator means to apply these sentiments to General Washington, when at the head of the American army, he has not chosen particularly to mention.

The following quotations, however, will shew how far Mr. Ames meant to eulogize the character of Washington, as commander in chief of the American army. After speaking of the *French revolution*, he says, "But it is only the influence of *that event* on America, and on the *measures of the President*, that belongs to my subject"----and while he speaks with the utmost indifference on the character of a "*great General*," he immediately extols him "as a *Chief Magistrate*, who appears like the pole star in a clear sky, to

direct the skilful statesman----*His Presidency* will form an epoch, and be distinguished as the *Age of Washington.*" Mr. Ames from these observations, endeavours to lower the military character of Washington, and attempts to exhibit the brilliancy of his reputation in his *civil capacity*. But where is the American, who has the feelings of '75, that would wish to eclipse his glory and honour, during the trying period of our revolution?

If this was not his intention, why does he introduce the disgusting idea, that, "in times of *violent convulsions*, and in ages of *despotism* and *darkness*, great Generals rise by the force of the whirlwind, high enough to ride in it, and direct the storm"? Is this observation any way analogous to Washington? Was it an age of "*despotism* and *darkness*," when the Americans were contending against Great-Britain for their rights and liberties? Did Washington ride in the storm of "*violence* and *convulsion*"; or like a "meteor glare on the black clouds with a splendour, that while *he dazzled and terrified*, made nothing visible but *darkness?* If he did not, why does Mr. Ames, in an Eulogy commemorating his sublime virtues as a "*General*," throw this dark picture into view, and exclaim with a peculiar rhapsody, "that however the *military fame* of Washington may excite the *wonder* of mankind, it is chiefly by his *civil magistracy* that *his example will instruct them?*" Are then the sublime virtues of Washington, as displayed during the distressing periods of our revolution, to be so far undervalued, as only to excite the "*wonder of mankind*;" while his *civil magistracy* "is held up as the only *example to instruct them?*" In his military character, was he only to be "viewed as a dazzling, terrifying meteor;" while his *civil conduct*, was the medium through which "*his example* was to *instruct them?*" Was not *his* "*example* instructing," when he led the American army through the various difficulties and perplexities with which they were surrounded? Were not his firmness, intrepidity and patriotism worthy of *imitation*, while contending for the liberties of his fellow-citizens? and was not his perseverance, amid the innumerable distresses he had to encounter, an *example to instruct us*, against the wiles and stratagems of Britain? In this exalted station as *Commander in chief of the American army*, in *opposition to Britain*, the illustrious Washington appears pre-eminent ---while under the direction of a patriotic band of worthies, assembled *in Congress*, (when an Hancock presided, and a Samuel Adams

was a member) he ſhone conſpicuous as the "defender of his country." In this character, Waſhington will ever receive the applauſe of the virtuous citizens, and they will reverence his name while the horrors of *Britiſh tyranny* are impreſſed on the minds of Americans. The tear of moſt grateful affection will be ſhed on the remembrance of his virtues at the times "which tried men's ſouls." The *republican Americans* recollect him in the field of battle, ſurrounded with the *myrmidons of Britain.* They view him, with his heroic (though *injured*) *army*, beſet on all ſides with *Britons*, *Heſſians*, and *Tories.* They now recount his deeds of valour, and inſtruct their liſtening children in thoſe "examples" which he ſet them to oppoſe the deſpotiſm and artful deſigns of their former foes. Theſe are the ſtrong traits which they will ever conſider within *their plan* to dilate on his character.

Though it may be for the intereſt of ſome, to obliterate from the American page the *military fame* of Waſhington, yet every true American will conſider him during our revolution, "like the pole ſtar in the clear ſky to direct the ſkilful ſtateſman": Like a ſun that diſpelled the black clouds of Britiſh *Tyranny*, and with its luſtre terrified every lurking knave, who was planning in darkneſs to deſtroy his country.

As a proof of the propriety of my obſervations, the orator even in his relation of the American war, paſſes over it with this ſlight remark:----That "neither the *object*, or limits of his plan, would permit him to dilate on the *military events* of the revolutionary war." The *object* of Mr. Ames was not (by his own confeſſion) to diſtinguiſh *General* Waſhington in the glorious achievements of our revolution. The brilliancy of his character, in this ſituation, was not within the "plan" of his eulogy. The ſublime virtues of Waſhington, which rivet him in the hearts of his fellow-citizens, during our conteſt with Britain, are ſo feebly impreſſed on the mind of Mr. Ames, that he ſeems to *apologize* for mentioning them, as being detached from the great "OBJECT" *he had* in commemorating his reputation. Is it poſſible, that ſuch a pointed ſarcaſm could be delivered before the legiſlature of Maſſachuſetts? The patriots, who, at thoſe times, were in our *State legiſlature*, know too well the diſtreſſed ſtate of our country. They remember with bleeding hearts, when *they* and *Waſhington* were mutually engaged in the violent conflict for America and liberty! could it *then* be

ſuppoſed, that within ſo few years, the virtues of this *great General* in his moſt diſtreſſed ſituation, would not be " within the *object* of a plan" contemplated by an orator choſen to eulogize his diſtinguiſhed talents ?

What was the political character of Mr. Ames during our revolution, is not now a ſubject of inveſtigation ; but this is certain, that every friend to England, would not conſider it " an *object* within *their plan*" to exhibit the full luſtre of Waſhington while at war with Britain. They would tread lightly over this ground, and though common modeſty might lead them to ſpeak of the revolution, yet they would traverſe the path with as much velocity, as the duke of York while retrograding from his purſuers.

Theſe obſervations are not intended to be uncandidly ſevere ; but the deſign of this eulogy is too ſtrongly marked not to excite a jealouſy, that the character of Waſhington, in his revolutionary capacity, was but a ſecondary " object" with the orator. Inſtead of dilating on this ſubject, he turns his oration into a philippic againſt the French revolution, and almoſt loſes the hero of his panegyric, in his anethemas againſt that nation. A ſtranger would ſuppoſe, that he was appointed to calumniate the French, inſtead of eulogizing Waſhington ; for he declares, " his thoughts teem with a deep abhorrence of that revolution." What connection had this ſubject with the character of Waſhington ? Or rather, how could a man preſume to celebrate the virtues of Waſhington, who approved, by his letters to that government, of the " *riſe* and *progreſs*" of their revolution----who ſtiled them " a *wonderful people*," " a *magnanimous nation*" ; while he himſelf openly profeſſes the utmoſt abhorrence of their whole conduct ? If General Waſhington was right, Mr. Ames is wrong : for the former declared, in the moſt ſolemn manner, his approbation of the revolution, and requeſted to draw cloſer the bands of friendſhip ; while the latter, abhors with the utmoſt deteſtation every principle of it, and further ſays, that " it was hoſtile to all peace, or order in ſociety."

This however is a fact, that general Waſhington, in his letter to that government by Mr. Monroe, has eulogized the French revolution in its riſe and progreſs, beyond any man that ever wrote or ſpoke on the ſubject. Judge then, fellow-citizens, between the opinion of General GEORGE WASHINGTON, late Preſident of the United States (the ſplendour of whoſe name en-

lightens the world)----and, Fiſher Ames, Eſq. a practitioner of law.

The foregoing remarks are only as they reſpect principle, but the following quotation is a ſpecimen of his compoſition :----

" *I* do not know that *I* ought, but *I* am ſure, that *I* do, prefer thoſe republics to the dozing ſlavery of the modern Greece," &c. Here is a diſplay of *egotiſm*, which a modeſt author ought to bluſh at. But an impropriety of compoſition is more excuſeable than an impropriety of principle ; it is not, therefore, of any importance to try him in the crucible of criticiſm.

No. IX.

ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

WASHINGTON ! thou illuſtrious ſhade ! pardon the attempt to arreſt thy " *military fame*" from the aſperſions of thoſe, who preſumptuouſly rank themſelves among thy excluſive friends. The republican citizens retrace, with enthuſiaſtic affection, thoſe periods when thou and thy patriotic companions were encountering the hoſtile inroads of a hoſt of Britons, and their ſanguinary coadjutors—when every man's face turned pale, and every man's hand was on his thigh—when the flames of our conflagrated cities were aſcending to Heaven, and " garments roll'd in blood" were diſplayed as the trophies of a deſolating ſoldiery—when frantic mothers were bewailing the maſſacre of their children, and weeping daughters were aſſembled to mourn over the mangled corſes of their expiring parents—when the citizens of Boſton, Charleſtown, &c. were drove from their habitations, and ſought refuge from the perſecution of a mercenary banditti—when the inhabitants of America were ſuffering under the ſevere tortures of *Britiſh inhumanity*, and their guard-ſhips were appropriated as the ſlaughter-houſe from whoſe " bourne no priſoner returned." At this important criſis, how did we hail you as the " defender of our country" ! At thy name every heart leaped for joy, amid the moſt trying ſcenes of our revolution. With the higheſt tranſport, *the real ſons* of America *now* enumerate the ſublime virtues which accompliſhed the arduous work of AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

But, illuſtrious ſhade! how would you have ſtood appalled, if, in thoſe intereſting periods, ſome prophetic voice had arreſted you in the following accents:—Waſhington! thy "*military fame* MAY excite the *wonder of mankind*, but it is chiefly by thy *civil magiſtracy* that thine example *will inſtruct them*"—"GREAT GENERALS have ariſen *in all ages* of the world, and perhaps *moſt* in thoſe of *deſpotiſm* and *darkneſs*"—"In times of *convulſion* and *violence* they riſe, by the force of the whirlwind, *high enough to ride in it*, and direct the ſtorm—Like METEORS, they glare on the black clouds with ſplendour, that, while it dazzles and *terrifies*, makes nothing viſible but *darkneſs*—The fame of heroes is indeed growing VULGAR: they multiply in every large war: they ſtand in hiſtory, and thicken in their ranks, almoſt as *undiſtinguiſhed* as their own ſoldiers."

On hearing ſuch language, even if it had been ſpoken by the *Guardian Angel* of America, would you not have exclaimed:—Gracious God! is it poſſible that my "*military fame*" ſhould be thus degraded? After all the toils, dangers, and hardſhips which I have encountered, to eſtabliſh the peace, liberty, and independence of my country—after quitting my happy domeſtic retreat on the ſummit of Mount Vernon—after all the weariſome nights which I experienced, during the long revolutionary conflict,—are all theſe ſacrifices to be eſtimated at ſo low a rate as only to "excite the *wonder* of mankind?" Are the American army, and the hoſt of "great Generals" now contending with me in the cauſe of their country, to be conſidered "like METEORS, which glare on the black clouds with ſplendour, and make nothing viſible but *darkneſs*?" *Can it be poſſible* that the "fame of theſe heroes will grow *vulgar*"; or "ſtand in hiſtory almoſt as *undiſtinguiſhed* as their ſoldiers?"—This would have been the ſoliloquy of Waſhington, had he been called to contemplate a ſubject in which HE and HIS ARMY had been thus implicated.

It is probable, that Mr. Ames may think that this is too high-wrought a deſcription of his oration. But, in conſidering this ſubject, I do not mean to take a latitude beyond what a fair conſtruction of "*his plan and deſign*" will admit. I do not however, in theſe obſervations, mean to draw "a picture, flat as the canvas"; or erect "a ſtatue, cold as the marble on which it is repreſented"; neither "cold, alas," as *his eulogy* is expreſſive of the magnanimity and virtues of Waſhington. But as Mr. Ames's oration is extol-

led by ſome, who *were inimical to our revolution*, as the moſt exalted panegyric that has been delivered on the hero of Mount Vernon, it is proper to try the performance by that touchſtone which affected the minds of the American citizens, "at the times which tried men's ſouls."

It muſt be acknowledged *as a conceded principle*, that when a man is eulogizing a hero, without ſignalizing one ſingle achievement performed by him, but on the contrary brings into view ſuch reflections as derogate from the moſt prominent ſtation which the perſon ſuſtained, inſtead of exalting, he lowers the reputation he pretends to commemorate. The character of Waſhington as a General, muſt be allowed to ſtand pre-eminently conſpicuous; it therefore muſt be the higheſt abſurdity in Mr. Ames, as an eulogiſt, to throw a veil over this part of his conduct, by comparing "great generals to a meteor," or that they make "nothing viſible but the darkneſs." But the abſurdity is ten-fold increaſed when he declares, that ſuch "perhaps have ariſen *moſt* in times of *deſpotiſm*." It behoves him then to point out a *greater general* than Waſhington. If he does not, we muſt conclude, that he means to inſinuate that the American revolution was an age of *deſpotiſm*, and that the great generals engaged in it made nothing viſible but their darkneſs.

However, not to dwell longer on this part of his oration, we will examine how far his eulogy goes towards exalting the character of Waſhington, on that point in which he is explicit. Mr. Ames recommends chiefly his *civil magiſtracy*, and particularly refers to the *French revolution*. It may be thought a redundancy, to mention again this part of his oration, but it is ſo material to ſhew the impropriety of his pretended eulogy, that I cannot but contraſt a little further *his ſentiments* on the French republic, with thoſe of Waſhington----more eſpecially as he recommends his example on *that event*, as worthy of imitation. The following ſublime ſentiments were penned by Waſhington, and under his own ſignature were ſent to the National Convention, in the year 1796. So recent a diſplay of fraternity muſt confound Mr. Ames, if he means to hold to his preſent declaration, "that the French revolution has been, *from the firſt*, hoſtile to all right and juſtice, to all peace and order in ſociety, and that *its very exiſtence* has been a ſtate of war-

fare againſt the civilized world, and moſt of all againſt *free* and *orderly republics.*" This is the *modeſt* opinion of Mr. Ames on the French revolution. Let us now ſee what were the ſentiments of Waſhington on this nation thus reprobated by our orator. His letter to the preſident of the National Convention is fraught with the following affectionate declarations :----

" Born, ſir, in a land of liberty ; having early learned its value ; having engaged in a *perilous conflict* to defend it ; having, in a word, devoted the beſt years of my life to ſecure it a *permanent eſtabliſhment* in my own country : my anxious recollections, my *ſympathetic feelings*, and my *beſt wiſhes*, are *irreſiſtibly* excited, whenſoever, in any country, I ſee an *oppreſſed nation* unfurl the banners of freedom. *But above all*, the events of the French revolution have produced the deepeſt ſolicitude, as well as the *higheſt admiration*. To call your nation *brave*, were to pronounce but common praiſe—WONDERFUL PEOPLE ! ages to come will read with aſtoniſhment the hiſtory of your *brilliant exploits*.

" In delivering to you theſe ſentiments, I expreſs not only *my own feelings*, BUT THOSE OF MY FELLOW-CITIZENS, in relation to the *commencement*, the *progreſs*, and *the iſſue* of the French revolution. And *they* will cordially join *with me* in pureſt wiſhes to the SUPREME BEING, that the citizens of our SISTER REPUBLIC, our MAGNANIMOUS ALLIES, may ſoon enjoy, in peace, that Liberty which they have purchaſed at ſo great a price, and all the happineſs which liberty can beſtow.

" I receive, ſir, with lively ſenſibility the ſymbol of the triumphs and of the enfranchiſement of your nation, the COLOURS OF FRANCE, which you have now preſented to the United States. The tranſaction will be announced to Congreſs ; and the colours will be depoſited with thoſe archives of the United States, which are at once the *evidences*, and the *memorial* of their freedom and independence—*may they be perpetual !* and may the friendſhip of the two Republics *be commenſurate with their exiſtence !*"

Such are the ſtrains in which Waſhington addreſſes the French Convention. Here, then, the contraſt is ſtriking : the mind of Mr. Ames teems with abhorrence, the ſoul of Waſhington expands with cordiality. " Horror gathers like a froſt" round the heart of the former, whilſt friendſhip drops like dew from the lips of the latter. Mr. Ames ſpurns them from his embraces as a crocodile,

but Washington enfolds them in his arms as *a sister republic.* One would tear asunder the flag of the Republic, while the other carefully depositis it within our choicest archives. Judge then, fellow-citizens, whether Mr. Ames is not an apostate from the man he means to eulogize.

A continuance of observations, on Mr. Ames's oration, may become tedious to my fellow-citizens; but as he has, by some strange fatality, become the champion of what are falsely called *federal measures*, the importance annexed to his sentiments are no otherwise worthy attention than to strip from him a mask under which many have deceived the public. His oration might furnish materials for a volume, rather than a newspaper; but, in my next, I shall confine myself to that apparent disaffection, which he shews towards the conduct of President Adams, in his late mission to France.

The many tropes, and figures, of "light-houses," "meteors," "stars," "black clouds," "giants," "whales," "caverns," "scorpions," "fire," "frost," "volcanoes," "whirlwinds," "pole stars," "milky way," &c. &c. are highly expressive of the immensity of his "teeming mind." He hatches metaphors like young chickens, and interspersers them into his performance with as much facility as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings.

No. X.

ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

MR. Ames in his answer to the Legislature candidly confesses, "in submitting his performance to publication, he exposes its *imperfections.*" If he was thus conscious to himself, that his oration would not bear the eye of criticism, it is remarkable that his diffidence had not excited a little more modesty, and dictated a language more congenial to the humiliation of his own feelings.

When an orator acknowledges "his extreme want of leisure, during the preparation" of his performance, it is reasonable to expect that a strain of caution and moderation would prevail in every paragraph; more especially, when speaking before a deliberative body, consisting of the Executive and Legislative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In the presence of so august an

aſſembly, ſentiments, and even words ſhould be weighed with the niceſt accuracy, and particularly on a ſubject in which the ſublime virtues of a Waſhington are the ſubjects for contemplation. It is but a poor excuſe for a man to plead the "want of leiſure," when he is honoured by the Legiſlature of a government to eulogize a character, "which is hung up in hiſtory as conſpicuouſly as if it ſparkled in one of the conſtellations of the ſky."

However, not to preſs Mr. Ames too cloſe on his apology, it ſeems that he did not feel quite ſo diffident as his anſwer to the Legiſlature implies. If he was apprehenſive of "*its imperfections*," why did he wiſh, "not to be conſidered merely in the midſt of the citizens of this town, or even of the ſtate"? "In idea, he gathered round him the nations." "In the vaſt and venerable congregation of the patriots of all countries, and of all enlightened men." He further ſays: "I would, if I could, raiſe my voice, and ſpeak to mankind in a ſtrain worthy of my audience, and elevated as my ſubject." If Mr. Ames was conſcious of "the imperfections" of his oration, why was he deſirous to gather round him ſuch an immenſe concourſe? It is rather ſingular, that he ſhould wiſh to expoſe his "*imperfections*" to all the world; to the whole congregation of patriots of all nations, and to all mankind: and this he was willing to do, "in a ſtrain worthy of his audience, and elevated as his ſubject." As a friend to Mr. Ames, I cannot think he would be deſirous to proclaim his "*imperfections*" ſo univerſally; but would rather ſuppoſe, that his apology to the Legiſlature aroſe from a conviction of the indecency of his remarks *after the delivery*, than from any previous reflections. It is probable, that ſome hint had been given him, as to the deficiency, both in the *compoſition* and *ſentiment*; and his own ingenuity had ſuggeſted a palliative, in the hacknied apology of "want of leiſure."

I ſhould not be ſo particular in obſerving ſuch minute parts of this oration, if the reputation of Mr. Ames had not have been held up by ſome as the *Demoſthenes of America*. I believe the Grecian orator never preſumed to addreſs his fellow-citizens on the moſt ſublime ſubjects, and then attempt to ſcreen his defects by declaring his "want of leiſure." Such kind of ſubterfuge might anſwer in common caſes, and among idle ſchool boys; but if the Athenian orator had been choſen by the Areopagus, to pronounce an eu-

logy on the moſt celebrated character of that age, he would not have ſuffered his literary fame to be tarniſhed, by admitting an "imperfection" on ſo important a ſubject; neither would he have ſuggeſted an idea, that "want of leiſure" ſhould be conſidered as an excuſe for the numerous defects in his performance. Demoſthenes would not have ſlumbered over the tomb of Waſhington. His mind would have been ſo deeply impreſſed with the ſublimity of the ſubject, that even during his controverſy with Eſchines, he would have found leiſure to commemorate the magnanimity of a hero like that of Mount Vernon.

But, if Mr. Ames *had not leiſure* to celebrate the virtues of Waſhington, it appears he had full time to reprobate the French revolution:—"His mind teemed with a deep abhorrence of it." Inſtead of contemplating, in its utmoſt magnitude, the hero of his eulogy, his mind was abſorbed in deteſtation of France. It is a pity he had not informed the Legiſlature of the ſtate of his mind; and declined an acceptance of ſo important a duty. This would have been much more reſpectful than to apologize for the "*imperfections*" of his oration, or to crave an indulgence from the want of leiſure.

I ſhall now, as was propoſed in my laſt, endeavour to ſhew the apparent diſaffection Mr. Ames expreſſes towards the late appointment of Commiſſioners to France. His violent paroxiſms againſt the French revolution, and againſt the government of that country, are ſtrong marks of an indecent cenſure on the Preſident of the United States. To ſay the leaſt, it was an indecent reflection on his attempt to reſtore harmony between the two Republics. The deluge of abuſe heaped upon them, muſt have a tendency to widen the breach between France and America, more eſpecially as this oration is publiſhed under the ſanction of the Legiſlature of Maſſachuſetts. What muſt be the opinion of the French government of our ſincerity, when they find ſuch a torrent of calumny thrown upon them, even at the time we are making overtures for accommodation? How can Mr. Ames juſtify his conduct, in thus ſtigmatizing with every epithet of odium, a nation with whom the Preſident is in ſerious negociation? While the Preſident has declared that he had received the moſt ſatisfactory aſſurances of the diſpoſition of the French government to receive our commiſſioners, is it not the higheſt arrogance in Mr. Ames, to reprobate

(in a *haſty performance*) the revolution, "as hoſtile to all right and juſtice, to all peace and order," and that "its very *exiſtence* has been a ſtate of warfare againſt the civilized world"? Does he mean to inſinuate, that the Preſident is deſirous to renew a connection with a people thus deſtitute of every amiable qualification, and that he is only ſporting with our future welfare in attempting a reconciliation? Such kind of language beſpeaks a diſreſpect to the meaſures of the Preſident, which is not becoming a man who, by ſpecial appointment, was pledging the ſentiments of the Executive and Legiſlative of one of the largeſt ſtates in the Union. By what authority did he preſume to bring into view the nation of France, when the vote of the Senate and Houſe of Repreſentatives never contemplated ſuch a ſubject? It was the moſt unparalleled effrontery in him, to take this opportunity to vent his invectives; and, under pretence of commemorating the virtues of Waſhington, to aſperſe a nation, within whoſe territory the Preſident had juſt ſent his commiſſioners. Muſt not this oration be conſidered as an inſidious counterpart to the pacific ſyſtem adopted by the Preſident, and, in ſome degree, intended to defeat the purpoſes for which it originated? I would not be uncharcharitable towards Mr. Ames, but it is a fact, that the Preſident has met with obſtacles in the buſineſs of negociation. A junto are oppoſed to him for this part of his conduct; and every baſe means is taken to thwart, and defeat an amicable termination of this embaſſy. A war faction are buſy to increaſe the diſſenſions; to prevent a renewal of friendſhip and intercourſe; to force the two Republics to open hoſtilities; to create a war with France, and to form an alliance with Britain. All the tools of this faction are induſtrious in their various departments to accompliſh theſe purpoſes, and while ſome are employed to calumniate that nation by their writings, others are as equally induſtrious to diſaffect the public mind by detraction and falſehoods. A war junto are now doubly active ſince the proſpect brightens for amity and good fellowſhip between France and the United States. They are afraid that their ſchemes for a ſtanding army, and other deteſtable plans which they had anticipated, will be fruſtrated; and, as ſuch proſpects decreaſe, they become more vigilant to effect their projects by fraud and ſtratagem. Such perſons are totally inattentive to the intereſt of the merchant, farmer, or tradeſman. They do not

conſider the embarraſſed ſtate of our commerce, and the immenſe injury to our trade, by the preſent ſtoppage of intercourſe with France: ſuch commercial conſiderations do not attract their notice. The great object with them is to obtain a war eſtabliſhment---and, under this patronage, to riot in luxury amid the general diſtreſs, and impoveriſhment of the country; to live on the toils and fatigues of the induſtrious; to increaſe the public burthens; augment LAND-TAXES; and, after throwing the community into convulſions, to employ a STANDING ARMY to force the people into a compliance with their arbitrary mandates. Such, for the moſt part, are the men oppoſed to Mr. Gerry, as governour of this Commonwealth;---he is for *Peace*, but they are for *War*.

Such reflections are not imaginary, they appear too ſerious to be doubted. If this was not the caſe, why do we find particular perſons ſo anxiouſly deſirous to prevent an amicable negociation with France? Why do we find them uſing the moſt irritating and abuſive language towards them at this important juncture? If theſe perſons were diſpoſed for peace, is it probable they would ſtudy ſuch numberleſs epithets to provoke the reſentment and excite the jealouſy of the French government? Or would they embrace every opportunity to vent their malice and chagrin at the conduct of the Preſident, for commencing the preſent negociation? Impoſſible, that men who were ſeriouſly in favour of peace, ſhould in all their actions and conduct expreſs ſo contrary a diſpoſition.

The Britiſh faction are now reduced to their *ne plus ultra*. They know that the buſineſs between the two Republics is in a train for an amicable ſettlement. They are convinced if this ſhould take place, that a Britiſh influence would be weakened in this country. The Old Tories, and men of monarchical principles, are pleaſed while the controverſy ſubſiſts between France and the United States, and they exultingly anticipate the period when the ſwords of the Americans will be drawn againſt France, and their arms extended to embrace Britain.

Gracious heaven! can there be men who call themſelves citizens of the United States, ſtill attached to a connection with Britain, and deſirous of a war with France? Let ſuch perſons read the cruelties of the Britiſh during our revolution---let them read the horrid maſſacres of their fellow citizens---let them revert to thoſe

periods when Britons and Heſſians were prowling through our defenceleſs towns, and marking their footſteps with the blood of the innocent inhabitants; let them aſk themſelves this ſerious queſtion, whether they can place any confidence in the friendſhip of a nation, which has purſued every ſyſtem of terror to accompliſh their purpoſes? Ye advocates for England, talk no more about *Religion*----were not the ſacred temples of the Almighty, appropriated by them to the vileſt purpoſes? Even the venerable ſanctuary, where the pious Prince and Sewall wept over their audience, was converted to an equeſtrian theatre----where the ſaints aſſembled, there the unhallowed footſteps of a blaſphemous banditti marked their outrageous depredations.

Theſe remarks may appear foreign to *Obſervations on Mr. Ames's Oration*----but, when we obſerve a diſpoſition in any man to counteract, *by indecent reflections on the French nation*, the amicable negociation now pending, it naturally excites ſentiments of the foregoing nature. If Mr. Ames was a friend to peace, would it not have been prudent to ſuppreſs the indignation of his mind with reſpect to France? Why ſhould he vent his calumny at this criſis, when every effort is making to cloſe the breach which has unfortunately taken place? If the Preſident is willing to heal the wound, why ſhould he apply any corroſive to irritate and inflame it? Would a friend to the Preſident attempt to open *new wounds*, when he is uſing meaſures to cloſe the *old?* Could we expect this from Mr. Ames, whoſe pathetic ſpeech in Congreſs *againſt a war with Britain*, contraſted Indians, tomahawks, and ſcalping-knives, with peace, liberty, and ſafety?

The obſervations made by a writer with the ſignature of "NEW SOUTH," I ſhall conſider at "*my leiſure.*" They appear too trifling to draw me aſide from a *few more obſervations* on Mr. Ames's oration; after I have gone through, I ſhall clip the wings of this *new fledged* rara avis.

No. XI.

ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

A Propriety of language, and a dignity of deportment, are two eſſential qualities of an orator. It is derogatory to a public ſpeaker to

uſe opprobrious epithets, or to take an advantage, from the excluſive privilege of his ſituation, to abuſe nations or even individuals. It diſcovers a ſordid diſpoſition to improve an opportunity (when interruption would be deemed an indecency) to calumniate thoſe, who cannot anſwer for themſelves; and when a man arrogantly aſſumes this mode to vent his invectives, it diſplays a ſtrong mark of the malignancy of his heart.

Mr. Ames, when placed within the *ſanctum ſanctorum* of the Old South, arrayed in his ſable habiliments, felt that kind of ſecurity, which has too often been improved within the ſacred deſk, to advance principles, and enforce dogmas analogous to the feelings and perſonal reſentment of the ſpeaker. Thus elated, he knew that whatever he might ſay, would not expoſe him to an immediate explanation; and, under this impreſſion, he felt a confidence in wiſhing to "gather round him the nations"; and with a ſupercilious aſſurance, was anxious to "raiſe his voice to a ſtrain which could be heard by all mankind."

But to check the flight of this enraptured enthuſiaſt, let us ſuppoſe him placed within the *hearing of the army of France*; would he dared to have vociferated "that the French revolution has been, *from the firſt*, hoſtile to all right and juſtice, to all peace and order in ſociety, and that its very *exiſtence* has been a ſtate of warfare againſt the civilized world"? It is a diſgrace for a perſon to ſay that *behind a man's back*, that he is afraid to ſay to *his face*. Mr. Ames, though vaunting in a pulpit that he wiſhed to be "heard by all mankind," would have exhibited a ſtrong deſcription of the tremor of Belſhazzar, if Bonaparte had at that moment been announced, as one of his audience. On ſuch an event, he would have been a curious phenomenon in the hiſtory of Quixotiſm, to obſerve the change between the bombaſtic fulminations of an orator, when he conſidered his antagoniſt at three thouſand miles diſtance, and the placid ſtrains of complacency when he expected to confront him on his deſcent from the roſtrum.

Mr. Ames, in his reply to the Legiſlature, acknowledges his oration to be a *haſty performance*, and that he had not leiſure to conſider the ſubject; from thence we are to conclude, that he thought but little about *what he was ſaying*, or *who he was abuſing*. His oration was a kind of medical regimen, which ſerved to evap-

orate the effusions of his "teeming mind"; and his epithets, tropes and figures, like mercurial pills, served the valuable purpose of *discharging* the spleen and chagrin which for a long time had laid indigested within him. As those humours are now *worked* off, we hope he feels more composed and tranquil.

The French revolution is a subject worthy the contemplation of a philosopher. It is an epoch, which no history can parallel, and when a political character presumes to speak upon it, he undervalues his reputation by bringing into view the 'musty documents' of historical tradition. Where is the history that keeps pace in analogy with its rapid progress? It outstrips every slow, tedious process of former examples, and stands pre-eminent among those wonders which at once confound and astonish mankind. Bonaparte, in comparison with Cæsar, Alexander, and the long list of military characters which swell the page of history, is like the sun in its meridian splendour diffusing its rays among the inferior planets of the natural system. Such men are only viewed at a distance, like the *Georgium Sidus*, through a telescope; but Bonaparte is a luminary which displays its radiance not only within its own orbit, but illumines the extensive hemispheres of Europe, Asia, and America. He stands a monument of the particular attention of heaven; for, amidst the immensity of dangers by which he has been surrounded, he has never received a wound to stop for a moment the career of his glory. He has suffered innumerable deaths by his enemies, but he has risen from the grave with a tenfold increase of military fame. If the crocodiles have swallowed him, they have been obliged to disgorge their luxurious repast with an additional retinue to proclaim his re-entrance into life, and with fresh laurels to adorn the brow of their engulphed hero.----The combined powers of Europe have alternately been obliged to submit to the invincibility of this "wonderful people"; and we may daily expect to hear that the Emperor, with his prowling beast of prey, Suwarrow, are suppliants for their mercy. Britain may possibly have the honour of being the last to acknowledge their sovereignty; but the energy of the present government will probably force her to a compliance, in order to prevent the inroads of a "*conservative power*" (directed by Bonaparte) to check the lawless domination of this tyrannical nation. The letter of *Consul Bonaparte* to the *King* may be the precursor of such an event.

The French revolution thus ſoars beyond the idle tittle-tattle of a few ſuperficial, local politicians in this country. The ſhort-ſighted policy of a funding ſyſtem----the menial ſycophancy of a Britiſh alliance----the trifling conſiderations of pecuniary appointments, the paltry efforts of a ſelf-created ariſtocracy in America, are all loſt in the great plan of the French revolution. The expenſive monarchical, ariſtocratical, and prieſtly modes of their former government are completely annihilated, or at leaſt are placed in that direction as muſt eventually deſtroy the pernicious principles which for centuries have been the ſcourge of that nation. The government is now free from the voracious demands of *bankrupts*; who, in ſome republics, are conſidered as national paupers, to be provided for by commiſſions in the army and navy. The levee of a Queen was a greater burden to the people of France than the whole expenditure of their preſent civil eſtabliſhment.

To judge of the French revolution, we muſt recur to their former ſituation under the monarchy: and when Mr. Ames talks about French jacobiniſm, "as inſpiring a fanaticiſm that was intolerant and contagious," he ought to have brought into view the gloomy receſſes of the BASTILE! the deſpotiſm and extravagance of the monarchy, and the the horrid impoſitions of the Popiſh hierarchy. This ſpirit of jacobiniſm, which he reprobates, was neceſſary to counteract the immenſe preſſure upon the liberties and property of the citizens, and became the only efficacious medium to oppoſe the tyrannical meaſures of their former government.

This jacobiniſm was ſimilar to the ſpirit which animated Waſhington, Hancock, Adams, and the hoſt of patriots during the American revolution; and had Great-Britain accompliſhed her wicked purpoſes, theſe heroes would have been ſtigmatized as jacobins and ſuffered the penalty of rebels. The term *jacobin* is of modern coinage, but its real ſignification (as applied by thoſe falſely ſtyled federaliſts) is comprized in the *old-faſhioned* word, REBEL. The tories would have been equally as induſtrious, during our revolution, to ſtamp the epithet *jacobin* upon Congreſs, the American army, with the arch-jacobin Waſhington at their head, as they now are to give this appellation to the leading characters in the French nation. The traitor Hutchinſon, if the term jacobin had been then in vogue would have been conſtantly dinging in the ear of his Majeſty, that "jacobiniſm had become in America rather a ſect, than a

party" ; " inſpiring a fanaticiſm that was equally intolerant and contagious." The Engliſh papers would have been conſtantly teeming with this opprobrious epithet. Lord North would have re-echoed in the Britiſh Parliament, " the contagion of the jacobin faction," and every conſpicuous character in the United States would have been reprobated as the fomenter of inſurrection, and promulgator of diſorganizing principles.

Every attempt to reſtore the liberties of mankind, or to check the progreſs of arbitrary power, is now ſtyled jacobiniſm. If the people of Ireland make any exertions to maintain their rights, or oppoſe the cruelties of a mercenary ſoldiery, they are marked out as the objects of miniſterial vengeance under this deſignation. If the French people eſpouſe their liberties, againſt the outrages of a monarchy, nobility, and prieſthood, the weapons wielded in oppoſition to them are the proſtituted epithets of diſorganizers, anarchiſts, and jacobins.

If Mr. Ames means to be conſidered as the defender of the *old ſyſtem* of France, under which the tortures of the Baſtile were exerciſed----the extravagant expenditures of the crown----the vaſſalage of the citizens, under the impoſitions of a numerous body of nobility----and their ignorance ariſing from the abſurdities introduced by a phalanx of voracious prieſts : If he is the advocate for theſe eſtabliſhments, let him ſtep forward in a manly avowal of his principles, rather than by an inſidious reflection on thoſe patriotic efforts which have been made to reſtore the equal rights of the citizens.

Mr. Ames, while reprobating France as purſuing a jacobinical ſyſtem, has the audacity to aſſert, that the ſame deſtructive ſentiments are prevailing in this country. *An oppoſition to the Federal Conſtitution* is generally defined to conſtitute the character of a jacobin. Upon this ground, I am willing to meet Mr. Ames ; and am ready to place the ſtigma upon that body of men, among whom the greateſt attempts have been made to deſtroy thoſe *republican principles*, on which this Conſtitution is founded.

From what quarter has a *ſtanding army* been advocated ? From whence is it, that the economical ſyſtem has been ſo far ſuperſeded, that the impoſt and exciſe have not been equal to the exigences of our government ? From whence have land taxes ariſen----ſtamp duties----bank eſtabliſhments----with a numerous train of ex-

penſive official appointments, which have encreaſed the national debt to its preſent magnitude? Who were the men in favour of a treaty, which will probably deceive the merchant, and expoſe the farmer to a demand of ſeveral millions? Who are now deſirous to counteract the amicable negociation now pending in France? Are thoſe the men whom Mr. Ames would deſignate as the friends to our *Republican Conſtitution*? or would he repreſent their oppoſers as a jacobin faction? Have not this *latter claſs* of citizens been conſtantly urging economical meaſures; and in all their proceedings, both in and out of Congreſs, have they not been aſſiduous to prevent the pernicious tendency of extravagant expenſes? The debates in Congreſs are evidences of their exertions to maintain the *purity* of the Republican ſyſtem, to reſtore the friendſhip of France, and a deſire to retrench the expenditures of the government within the real abilities of the people to diſcharge them. I may venture to ſay, if theſe traits conſtitute a JACOBIN, that a large proportion of the *real citizens* are of this deſcription.

But, to come cloſer towards Mr. Ames, as it relates to the *Conſtitution*, and the diſpoſition of certain individuals to alter its *republican properties*, I would aſk him (and he is *requeſted* to anſwer) whether he is not the author of the following remarks in Miſs Hannah Adams's hiſtory of New-England? If he is, let the citizens judge who are the men, that are deſirous to change the eſſential principles of the Federal Conſtitution.----Who are the men, that are anxious to ſubvert the ſtate ſovereignties, and to eſtabliſh a complete conſolidation----and provided jacobiniſm is defined to be, *an attempt to change our preſent Conſtitution*, the queſtion is, whether men of this ſtamp are not deſerving the obnoxious epithet.

The remarks, referred to, ſtand thus in page 496 of the above-mentioned hiſtory :----

"The withholding of a *complete negative* from the Preſident, the *interference of the Senate* in appointments to office, *the mode of their election by the reſpective ſtates*, the want of *permanency* in that body, ſufficient for their *ſelf-preſervation* againſt the paroxiſm of ſudden, democratic intemperance which have generally denied to republics the enjoyment of both tranquillity and longevity, and ABOVE ALL, the diſcordant and ſeemingly *anarchical* conflict of national and *ſtate ſovereignties*, the imperium in imperio, are yet conſidered *by many* as deviations from a *correct political theory*."

In this propoſition, an " unchecked, unbalanced" Preſident, and an hereditary Senate, are contemplated----an uncontroled appointment of offices by the Executive, and an annihilation of the ſtate governments, are all conſidered as eſſential to form a " correct political theory."----Can any man who advocates ſuch a plan be ſtyled a Federaliſt ? Can he be called a friend to the exiſting Conſtitution ? Are not all the *Republican* and *Federal* traits of our government exploded, ſhould ſuch amendments be introduced ? Could a modeſt man preſume to reprobate others for attempting to ſubvert the Conſtitution, if he himſelf propoſed a change which ſtruck ſo radically at its vital principles ?

It has ever been the policy of monarchiſts and ariſtocrats to effect their purpoſes by certain cant terms, which they circulate with peculiar facility, as deſcriptive of their own ſentiments and thoſe of their opponents----*Federal* and *Anti-Federal* have been uſed by them with remarkable ſucceſs to favour their deſigns. While ſuch perſons ſtyle themſelves *Federaliſts*, they have in moſt inſtances been endeavouring to *conſolidate*, not only the *Federal* government in the hands of the Executive, but have been equally anxious to annihilate the ſovereignty of the reſpective States. Inſtead of calling themſelves *Federaliſts*, they are more properly ſtyled *Conſolidationiſts*. The Anti-Federaliſts (ſo called) are in fact the *Real Federaliſts*, as they have on all occaſions endeavoured to keep the powers of the Executive, Legiſlative, and Judicial, as ſeparate as they are contemplated in the letter and ſpirit of the Conſtitution. Under the term *Federaliſm*, many projects have been accompliſhed, and armed with this deceptive appellation, theſe *real Anti-Federaliſts* have aſſumed the excluſive title of *ſupporters of the Federal Conſtitution*. They have ſo artfully played their tricks, that, like jugglers, they have thrown a miſt over the public mind, ſolely calculated to miſlead every man who is not aware of the deception.

But, fellow-citizens, the paſſage quoted from Miſs Adams's hiſtory, came from a man who was " high in office," and calls himſelf a *Federaliſt*. How far it is conſonant with thoſe Republican principles maintained in our ſtate Conventions, is left to the candid conſideration of every impartial citizen. If ſuch a ſyſtem ſhould be adopted, what features of the preſent Conſtitution would be preſerved ? It would be ſo radical a change, that ſcarce one veſtige would remain of its preſent theory ; and yet thoſe very

perſons who are trying to bring the *Federal* Conſtitution into this diſtorted form, have the effrontery to ſtigmatize their antagoniſts as *Jacobins*, and ſubverters of the exiſting government.

Upon the whole, while reviewing Mr. Ames's oration, it appears intended rather as a philippic on political characters both in France and America, than an Eulogy on *General* Waſhington. It carries an inſidious reflection on the late conduct of the Preſident ----it is bombaſtic in diction, but "flat as the canvas" in ſentiment----it is crouded with fiction, tropes, and figures, which are abſurd in their application----it is ſcurrilous and abuſive, and deſtitute of thoſe eſſential qualities which conſtitute the ſcholar, or deſignate the politician.

No. XII.

A FEW CANDID REMARKS ON "NEW-SOUTH."

THE principal object contemplated in the obſervations on Mr. Ames's oration was, that it had more the appearance of a *philippic againſt France*, than an *Eulogy on Waſhington*. A writer who ſtyles himſelf "*New-South*," has denied the poſition, and attempts to prove, by inſerting a paragraph of about twenty lines, (from an oration of 31 pages,) that Mr. Ames had done full juſtice to the "*military character*" of Waſhington.

This author, however, has placed the controverſy in ſo perplexed a point of view, before the public, that we are at a loſs to know who or what he means to vindicate. He ſets out in a violent paſſion to reprobate the idea, that Mr. Ames is deficient in reſpect to the Hero of Mount Vernon; but, like all other over-heated enthuſiaſts, he ſoon forgets his ſubject. He begins with General WASHINGTON, and ends with Lawyer *Ames*....he ſtyles his oration as the "greateſt effort of genius and talent"; and that even the "*honied eloquence* of a Kirkland" is not to be compared with it. "The *liquid periods* of the *counſellor*," he ſays, "cannot fail of receiving the *homage of taſte*." In the midſt of his rhapſody, he leaves Waſhington "in the cold ground," and thus proceeds to eulogize the ſeraphic Ames: "His eloquence will form an epoch in our country, and be diſtinguiſhed as the AGE OF AMES: *Al-*

ready it assumes its high place in the regions of *oratory*; like the *milky way*, it whitens along its alloted portion of the hemisphere; our future rhetoricians will survey, through the *telescope of biography*, the space where so many beauties blend their rays, and delight to separate them into groups and distinct figures. The first of speakers may safely consign his fame to this *monument of his powers*, for it will live among the remotest days of Columbian liberty and happiness, and mingle its author's mild glory with Washington's." The above is a specimen of the sublime, which would add laurels to the brow of a Sheridan.

It is a pity that *New-South* had not consulted with Mr. Ames, previous to his publication, in order that they might have agreed between themselves as to the subject of eulogy---for, as it now stands, they are so at variance that it is difficult to reconcile them. One says, that it is the "age of Washington"; and the other, that it is the "age of Ames." One declares, that "two Washingtons cannot come in one age"; and the other says, equally as peremptorily, that two exist at one period. *New-South* has taken the climax of Washington's character, and applied it to Mr. Ames. Instead of contemplating Washington, in the sublime regions of bliss and glory, we are led through the "*milky way*" to explore the ascent of Mr. Ames, "in *his* alloted portion of the hemisphere." We are called on to survey, through the telescope of biography, in the regions of oratory, a variety of beauties, rays, groups, and figures, while "the first of speakers consigns his fame to the *monument of his powers*, and mingles his mild glory with Washington's." I must plainly confess, that this sublime pathos soars vastly beyond my comprehension; but suppose it is meant to convey an idea, that the splendour of Mr. Ames (after passing through the regions of the milky way) will so mingle itself with the glory of Washington that it will be difficult to distinguish them.

If this is the real meaning, *New-South* has in every particular taken all the exclusive honour conferred on Washington, and placed it on Mr. Ames. If HE thus mingles his glory with Washington, his name must be equally "hung up in history as conspicuously as if it sparkled in one of the constellations of the sky." When Mr. Ames pays the debt of nature, some orator "must pronounce for posterity, *now dumb*, that eulogium, which they will delight to echo ten ages hence, when *we are dumb*." HE also is seen "like a star to cheer,

to guide, and to ſave" ; HE alſo appears "like a *light-houſe*, that gleams upon the ſurrounding darkneſs with inextinguiſhable ſplendour."

In ſhort, *New-South* has eulogized Mr. Ames, far beyond what this orator has expreſſed towards General Waſhington. Every trait of his character is depictured in the moſt pleaſing colours, and diſplayed in the moſt melting ſtrains. He does not bring into view, as analogous to any office he ſuſtained, "volcanoes," "black clouds," "whirlwinds," &c. ; but the ſofteſt language is introduced, ſuch as "honied eloquence," "liquid periods," and "milky way." While "great Generals, like meteors, dazzle and terrify," Mr. Ames ſhines with luſtre in "the regions of oratory, and whitens along his alloted portion of the hemiſphere." *New-South* exhibits the portrait of Waſhington "as flat as the canvas ;" while he ſoars among the ſtars with a "biographical teleſcope" in one hand, and the trumpet of fame in the other, deſcrying the rapid progreſs of Mr. Ames, and proclaiming his approach at "the MONUMENT OF HIS POWERS."

"*The monument of his powers*" ! This muſt be acknowledged as the utmoſt extent of human invention. To arrive at the ſpot where this monument is to be erected, he wafts Mr. Ames "through the regions of oratory" ; through "the milky way" ; through hemiſpheres unknown ; and, after hurrying him through ſuch a variety of climates, and exalting him to ſuch a point of elevation, he at length places him in that ſpace of exiſtence "where beauties blend their rays, and delight to ſeparate in groups and figures" ! Theſe are rhapſodies which beſpeak the great mind, and a moſt luxuriant fancy ; and we cannot but follow in idea, the biographer, with his teleſcope, prowling through "the milky way," "whitening in his progreſs their alloted portions of the hemiſphere." This is *bathos* ! !

It is not my intention to treat this ſubject too ludicrouſly, but as *New-South* has come forward in vindication of Mr. Ames, if he will accurately determine, whether it is the "age of Waſhington," or the age of Ames, I ſhall then be able to reply to his ingenious performance. But while the epoch hangs thus doubtful, it is needleſs to enter into the controverſy ; and if he and Mr. Ames will ſettle this point between themſelves, I ſhall readily pur-

ſue an inveſtigation of the ſubject. It is peculiarly unfortunate for *New-South* to ſtumble at the threſhold; for the fact is, he is more at variance with Mr. Ames, than he is with me; and the diſpute really lays between themſelves. If Mr. Ames is right, in ſaying that "this is the age of Waſhington," certainly *New-South* is wrong, in ſaying that "it is the age of Ames"—and ſo vice verſa. As this is a very important point, in which I do not chooſe to meddle, I ſhall wait with the utmoſt patience, till I am informed how they have determined the queſtion.——Till then, adieu.

No. XIII.

ON LACO AND HIS SATELLITES.

To the Author of "The Jefferſoniad," in the Centinel.

THE mode in which I have handled this ſubject, may appear a little ſingular to you and your party; but, before I cloſe, I believe you will find, that the controverſy is well underſtood, and a proper application will be made as to *your charges againſt Mr. Jefferſon.* ----As you are conſidered as a branch from this deteſtable junto, I ſhall in ſome future numbers treat you with that *familiarity* which your officiouſneſs deſerves. The Eſſex junto have had ſuch an exorbitant influence within the government of the United States for many years paſt, that it is neceſſary to appropriate a few publications to expoſe the ſecret deſigns and inſidious views of this fraternity. In the firſt place, I believe it can be clearly proved that every embarraſſment, under which the country labours, ariſes from them----that all the *virulence of parties* originated through this peſtiferous medium----that all the *deception* which has been practiſed, including *tub plots*, *Ocean maſſacres*, *Illuminati*, &c. originated from this artful, ſelf-aggrandizing faction. This junto have, from the firſt eſtabliſhment of the Conſtitution, been active to effect their plans, and for this purpoſe have inliſted into their ſervice a few *time-ſerving clergymen*, aided by a phalanx of ſycophants, office ſeekers, and war contractors, and thus embodied have watched every favourable opportunity to forward their deſtructive projects.

The *upſtart hirelings* of this junto have often been challenged to appear before the public with their real names; but like aſſaſſins they have attempted to abuſe the character of Mr. Jefferſon in pri-

vate caucuſſes, and under the ſhade of evening have ſculked within the walls of Vila's hall to vent their baſe inſinuations againſt the MAN, whoſe pen diſplayed not only the *ſpirit* of America, but ſtamped a *literary fame* on her character. When ſuch puſillanimous beings aſſume a licence, under the darkneſs of night, to villify the LUMINARY OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE, they ſhrink into the ſame contempt, as if a *glow worm* ſhould exhibit his taudry wings to eclipſe the radiency of the ſun in his meridian ſplendor.

Another inſect, of the ſame deſcription, has had the effrontery to talk about "making peace with France at the point of the bayonet." Such inſignificant chatterers may be indulged with ſuch hyperbole; for ſhould France contend with this country, ſuch liliputians would eſcape their notice, as it would be degrading for Bonaparte to exhibit them on the point of his bayonet. A flea in the paw of a lion would be but a poor compliment to the heroiſm of the ſovereign of the foreſt; an inſect of this ſize would not arreſt the notice of a man, who has contended over the Alps with the veterans of Auſtria.

During our controverſy with France, we have had the bombaſtic effuſions of warfare from thoſe who would fly (ſhould the conteſt become ſerious) to the utmoſt boundaries of creation, rather than confront the enemy in the field of battle; or if they ſhould be met with, by *accident*, the magnanimity of the French ſoldiery would paſs them in purſuit of an enemy worthy of their conqueſt.

To revert more particularly to the apparent cauſe of our difficulties with France, it is proper to obſerve, that the *Britiſh treaty* is the oſtenſible object of controverſy. This inſtrument was in the firſt inſtance unanimouſly reprobated, and though *Laco* was at the firſt town-meeting in Boſton, ſurrounded with his ſatellites, yet not a word eſcaped him or them in favour of its ratification. It was *unanimouſly* reprobated by the citizens, as injurious and ruinous to the commercial intereſt of the United States. Their ſilence can eaſily be accounted for, as the plan for adopting this Britiſh ſyſtem had not, at that time, be matured by the *firſt conſul* of this junto; his ſatellites were then waiting orders, and after they had received their peremptory mandates, inſtead of acting an honourable part to counteract the proceedings of the town, they held a *ſecret meeting*, and iſſued a *clandeſtine ſubſcription-paper* among the unwary citizens, to requeſt the neceſſary appropriations. Every inſignificant tool

of the junto was set in motion, and the streets of Boston were beset in every corner by a sub-committee to intimidate the unsuspecting tradesman to give his signature in favour of a treaty which he had previously condemned in town-meeting, and which it is said throws a debt or *demand* of twenty-one millions of dollars upon the citizens of the United States. An instrument, which may be considered as the source of all our difficulties between England and France, as it furnishes the former with a plea to take our vessels, and the latter a plausible pretence to treat us with indignity.—During this transaction, many had the effrontery to threaten the industrious tradesman with the loss of business, in case he refused signing; some of them however might at that time have considered party zeal as *profitable*, while the arrogance of *others* admits of no apology. Mr. Hamilton, it is said, was the first man who had the boldness publicly to advocate the adoption of the treaty, and when his partizans found he was successful in New-York, they assumed their wonted courage in other parts of the United States, and at length by *threats* and *deception* gained over a large proportion of the citizens.

I am willing to allow, that many who were active on this occasion, are not, strictly speaking, of the Essex junto. But the boldness and audacity of these persons have deceived many honest, well-disposed individuals. The insolence, however, of those who threatened the tradesmen with loss of work, ought never to be forgiven, as it shews the depravity of their mind, and the baseness of their conduct—a *purse-proud wretch*, who by accident has risen vastly beyond his expectations, when he attempts to deprive a tradesman of his liberty, should be ever viewed with that indignation which his impudence and ignorance merit. Should the body of tradesmen be controled by such *upstart lordlings*, they are unworthy the name of FREEMEN.

The British treaty was considered by the junto as the *ne plus ultra*; without this could be ratified, they knew that the controversy between France and America would be easily settled. Their plans were so deep, they found it necessary that an instrument of this baneful nature was essential to their purposes. They knew if they could entrap us with Britain, within the chains of a treaty, that it would give them an ascendancy in case any overtures should hereafter be made with France to settle existing difficulties.

They were well aware, that the articles of this compact, involved many important points, and should we attempt to make a treaty with France, that our *previous contracts with Britain* would embarrass us. All these particulars were understood by the junto, and therefore, after the ratification, every effort was made to irritate and calumniate the French. The English were held up as our only friends, and the French as the only nation against whom our resentment should be directed. Cockades were displayed as the countersign of French extermination. A well known blusterer in Boston, under the patronage of this popular phrenzy, was inflated with a *temporary courage* to pull from the hat of an *invalid Frenchman* the tri-coloured cockade :—this *hero* felt an assurance, under the mania of the moment, to disgrace the town of Boston in suffering his insolence to go unpunished. Every indecency was offered to a citizen who had spirit and resolution to withstand the general outrage on private judgment. During the paroxysm of the public mind, the junto took courage to denounce individuals. Many public papers were devoted to their service. They even had the impudence to mention who should be displaced from office ; and previous to the removal of Messrs. Gardner and Whipple of Portsmouth, the suggestion appeared in one of those papers.—During this public infatuation, and under the influence of the junto, how many respectable men were removed from office ? In the arrangement of the army, carried on by the Essex junto, how many veterans have been neglected ? and how many have been commissioned whose services are not known in the history of those times which "tried men's souls" ? In short, under the guidance of a junto, it is suspected the American government has been thrown into the most distorted position. The enemies of our revolution have in many instances risen to the highest degree of eminence, while the old soldier has been left to console himself with the prospect of better times. How many red plumes have been displayed in the hats of those who have no claim on our affection or gratitude !

This junto, we hope, has progressed to its utmost latitude. The President has at length found out their nefarious designs. He begins to discountenance their plans, and we trust is desirous to begin a system upon those principles which immortalized the "proscribed patriots, Adams and Hancock." We trust in God, the designs of the Essex junto are too well known for them ever

again to renew their iniquitous measures, and while we commiserate the MAN who has been deceived by their mischievous designs, we cannot but revere the political character of Mr. Jefferson, who was never duped by them. He always was aware of their intentions, and has *uniformly* been opposed to their measures. He rose superior to their plans, and has not now the mortification to acknowledge that he was in any instance influenced by them.----Happy would it have been for this country, if every man had been as discerning to avoid the machinations of a junto, who have brought this country to the brink of ruin. He who foresees evil, is worthy the confidence of an enlightened people.

No. XIV.

WHIG AND TORY.

To the Author of "The Jeffersoniad," in the Centinel.

AS you are but a "twig of the branch," sprouting from the root of the ESSEX JUNTO, and trying to recommend yourself to the notice of this detestable fraternity by abuse and scurrility, it is proper to give you a trait of those characters which are designated under this appellation. Your folly and ignorance are exhibited in such glowing colours, that it appears cruel to add to the deformity of your portrait, by displaying to the public the real characters of those, under whose patronage you are calumniating the patriotic Jefferson. A virtuous deist is preferable to a man who *professes Christianity* and violates its principles. Mr. Jefferson has endeavoured to emancipate the citizens of Virginia from the thraldom of a religious test; to give to Baptists, Quakers, and every other sect, the freedom of conscience;----and, whilst they act conformable to the Constitution and the laws, their tenets, he candidly supposes, will not "pick our pockets, nor break our legs." This doctrine is agreeable to the principles of the Federal Constitution, and to those of a large majority of the States.

At this enlightened period, when the dogmas of illiberal zealots are so universally reprobated, it is disgraceful for the people of the United States to censure the catholic sentiments of Mr. Jefferson;

or to hold him up as an object of reproach, for endeavouring to check the violence of religious persecution. As it relates to the oppressive laws of Virginia, at the time he wrote his observations, Mr. Jefferson stands in the same point of view as Luther in opposition to the tyranny of the Church of Rome----as Barclay, in vindication of the Quakers----as Mayhew and Chauncy, in vindicating the Dissenters----as Backus, Stillman, Baldwin, &c. in support of the privileges of the Baptists. In short, he is the vindicator of the rights of conscience, in opposition to all those baneful Tests which have been imposed on mankind. Instead of being stigmatized with the epithets of Atheist, and Deist, he is entitled to the respect of every citizen, let his *religious opinions* be what they may; and he has, as fully, and faithfully declared the *rights of conscience*, as he has the justness of AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE. He ever ought to be equally revered, by all religious sectaries, for his *catholicism*, as he is by the friends of the American revolution for his REPUBLICANISM. The baseness of a junto, in abusing this man, is the strongest evidence of their villany.

I shall now proceed by observing, that the Essex Junto always had a peculiar faculty in connecting *names* with *things*. During the witchcraft influence, every person selected for public vengeance by the junto, was hunted down under the appellation of *witch*. The WIZARDS of that day were as assiduous to raise a popular clamour against an innocent old woman, as they now are to excite an indignation against all those who are opposed to their political conspiracies. The term *jacobin*, they foolishly think, is as favourable to their political projects, as that of *witch* was to their religious fanaticism. The baseness of their designs never could depend on an investigation of principles; but they always took sanctuary under certain words, which operated like magic to effect their diabolical purposes. If Laco had been on the stage, in the time of witchcraft, his demure deportment, and monkish austerity would have qualified him for the grand Sanhedrim of judicial inquisition; and if a faultering old woman had been affrighted in his presence, or thrown into hysterics by his disgusting countenance, he would have thought it the highest display of his official integrity to condemn her to the stake, or the gallows, for her convulsions.

Your frequently using the word *jacobin*, in your publications, is a clear evidence that you belong to that ignominious party, emphatically styled the Essex Junto, or more properly *an American British faction*----For this fraternity does not solely reside in Essex, but it is a poisonous weed which has propagated itself throughout the United States. The *root* is planted in New-York, and the branches overspread America, and contaminate by their pestiferous exhalations a few individuals in every city and town throughout the Union.

What a glorious harvest! America in controversy with France! In controversy with a nation, who assisted us when oppressed by Britain; who lent us money, when our troops were naked and famished for want of this necessary aid; who sent her fleet, and reinforced our army with her veterans; who are now acting over the same tragedy in recovering their liberties, as was displayed on the heights of Bunker.

What a glorious harvest! In controversy with France, while Britain is still pursuing a system of depredation on our commerce; when their islands are thronged with American prizes; when the Thames is crowded with British captures; when their judges are condemning the hard-earned property of American citizens; when our seamen are impressed on board their navy. During this violation of our neutral rights, how surprising is it that we have a junto who are advocating British lenity! apologizing for their enormities, and opposed to a reconciliation with France.

Yes, fellow-citizens, we have such a faction in the bosom of our country: Men who are the supporters of Britain during their violation of our rights, and the plunder of our property. Their insidious measures have entrapped us into the wily machinations of our implacable foes. An enemy hath done this, and this enemy is no other than a FACTION, "crouching like tygers before they leap."

In order, therefore, to designate the party, let us henceforth use the old appropriate terms, WHIG and TORY.----The WHIGS are those who have long seen, and deprecated the influence obtained in this country, through the operation of certain leading characters. They have been styled *jacobins*, but they are the real supporters of the Federal Constitution, upon its *just principles*. They are aware of the artful designs of Britain, and have always been

jealous of these tories, who have favoured their measures. The WHIGS (falsely styled jacobins) are desirous to establish a government upon the equal rights of the citizens---ECONOMY in public expenditures----taxes within the ability, and agreeable to the circumstances of the people----a MILITIA instead of a standing army---- a PEACE WITH FRANCE----and a national character as it respects all the powers of Europe.

The TORIES are opposed to these measures; but are anxious to bring us into a controversy with France, and alliance with England. They are panting for a STANDING ARMY----an INCREASE of TAXES----a MULTIPLICITY OF OFFICERS :----In short, to bring us within the vortex of the British government, (which has been declared as the "most stupendous effort of human wisdom,") and to copy all the expensive systems which have nearly bankrupted that nation. Such are the men who oppose Mr. Jefferson.

These, sir, are my sentiments of a Junto, who are now, thank God, brought before the tribunal of the public; and may the vindictive resentment of an injured people never be satiated till they are placed in that *humble station*, in which they have attempted to *debase this country*.

No. XV.

RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.

To the Author of "The Jeffersoniad," in the Centinel.

YOUR principal charge against Mr. Jefferson is, that he is opposed to the Christian religion. But so far from proving this, you have not produced one evidence to support your allegation. On the contrary, if we are to judge from his writings, he is the advocate of that religion by which Christ has made us free. He has brought the whole system to that point, through which CONSCIENCE is to direct us in the great business of Salvation, in opposition to imposed articles of faith. He has vindicated this primary principle, in contradiction to those who placed themselves in the chair of *infallibility*; in some manner, as our Saviour did, in condemning

the ſcribes and phariſees during his pilgrimage on earth. The Jewiſh ſanhedrim ſet themſelves as the TEST of religious orthodoxy; and every act, which our Saviour did, was oppoſed by them, as ſubverting the eſtabliſhed ſyſtem of Jewiſh religion. The Church of England, in their religious creed, was as juſtly obnoxious to Mr. Jefferſon, and every catholic citizen, as the Jewiſh hierarchy was to our Saviour. This hypocritical junto were ſtigmatizing THE AUTHOR OF OUR RELIGION in the ſame opprobrious manner as the Eſſex junto now do Mr. Jefferſon. HIS diſciples were ſtyled men, "who were turning the world upſide down." The *Chief Prieſts*, Scribes, and Phariſees, were his moſt inveterate enemies. They would have crucified him much earlier than they did, "but for fear of the people." The People received him gladly, but the *Chief Prieſts* were always inflaming the minds of the multitude, and were the moſt deſperate foes he had to encounter. The fact is, the whole hiſtory of our Saviour ſhows, the *hypocriſy of prieſts and their minions*. They early combined againſt him, and by their inſidious machinations drove Pontius Pilate to condemn him.

The hiſtory of our Saviour ſhows the dangerous tendency of *Prieſtcraft*. When a country is once brought under their influence by eſtabliſhed Teſts, the moſt virtuous part of the community fall a ſacrifice to their fanaticiſm. Let any man read over the New Teſtament, and note down the frequent clamours of the *Chief Prieſts* and Rulers againſt our Saviour, and they will find, that the whole oppoſition to his miniſtry was through this medium, and their apprehenſions of the downfall of Diana of Epheſus. Judas received his thirty pieces of ſilver from them; and every deſperate meaſure to enſnare and betray him was by the ſecret plottings of a junto, influenced by the immediate agency of prieſts and their ſanguinary myrmidons. Even after he was crucified, "the Chief Prieſts gave large money to the ſoldiers," to fabricate a falſehood on his reſurrection.

This has been the caſe in all countries where religion is eſtabliſhed by government. The Church of Rome has thus been able to riſe to its pre-eminence. The Church of England, &c. have been founded on the baſis of an extenſive hierarchy. Our fathers fled from eccleſiaſtical tyranny and their ſons will never ſubmit to ſuch degrading ſervitude. In Virginia, before Mr. Jefferſon illumined the mind by his writings, a diſbelief in St. Athanaſius'

creed was a crime, which nothing but the flames of the ſtake could cancel. Confiſcations, impriſonments, whippings, and ſcourges, were the more lenient meaſures to proſelyte men to the abſurd doctrines of the Eſtabliſhed Syſtem. The mind of the people was enſlaved by prieſts, and the dogmas of the gown and ſurplice were to be equally obeyed with the oracles of the Supreme Being.

In this ſtate of things, who will not revere the magnanimity and catholiciſm of Mr. Jefferſon? Who will not eſteem him for enlarging the human mind to contemplate the great ſubject of religion? What American would wiſh to be enſlaved in his conſcience, and bound by halters and gibbets to adopt the tenets of a proud prieſt, who received an annual ſalary for lording it over Chriſt's heritage? Such abſurdities might anſwer in the dark ages when mankind were ſo ignorant, that a black coat, or lawn ſleeves, were as terrific, as the thunder and lightning from Mount Sinai. But, thank heaven, the world is too enlightened to be duped by prieſts; and the people can read, and determine on ſacred things with that liberality and correctneſs which ſpurn at the leading ſtrings of intereſted bigots. The days of martyrdom have long ſince paſſed away, and the torch of Smithfield has, thank God, been extinguiſhed.

Not but that the Clergy ought to be reſpected in their profeſſion; but to ſuppoſe that they are to dictate tenets, or that any ſect is to aſſume a right to control others, is an idea too derogatory to be admitted at the cloſe of the eighteenth century. Such prepoſterous abſurdities had their effect three centuries ago, but we hope the preſent generation will give an evidence, that they have grown wiſer than to ſubſcribe to ſuch ignominious articles of faith. To the honour of America, though of late a few clerical characters have diſgraced their profeſſion, and defiled their garments, yet the liberality of the Clergy in general cannot but excite our veneration. A Prince, Sewall, Mather, Colman, Chauncy, Mayhew, Cooper, and a Clarke, with others now on the ſtage, ſtand teſtimonials of their patriotiſm. Theſe great and good men were really champions in the cauſe of Religious Freedom, and ſtood forth in oppoſition to every arbitrary ſyſtem to enſlave or control the rights of conſcience. Theſe are men who would embrace Mr. Jefferſon with the utmoſt cordiality.

The abuſive treatment given to Mr. Jefferſon by you, Decius, and others, is a proof of the baſeneſs of your cauſe, and the folly of your conduct. I would aſk, whether you ſuppoſe that the people of the United States will ever ſubſcribe to a Religious Teſt? Do you expect that the Quakers, Baptiſts, Congregationaliſts, Univerſaliſts, Unitarians, &c. will admit the infallibility of any particular Church? Do you expect that they will join St. Athanaſius in his anathemas?—You may pretend to talk about Mr. Jefferſon's infidelity, but your whole charge againſt him amounts to this, that he reprobates in his writings, the impoſitions on the various profeſſions which differ from the Engliſh hierarchy and ſupremacy. Do you mean to contraſt Mr. Jefferſon with Mr. Adams? Do you wiſh to inſinuate, that Mr. Adams is in favour of a Religious Teſt, as a national eſtabliſhment? While you condemn Mr. Jefferſon for his catholiciſm, are you deſirous to repreſent Mr. Adams as the advocate of an *arbitrary church diſcipline?* In plain words, are you for an Inquiſition? Let us, Decius, underſtand the object you are aiming to accompliſh. Are you daring enough to ſay, that Mr. Jefferſon is unfit for Preſident, *becauſe he is a friend to the* RIGHTS *of* CONSCIENCE, and that Mr. Adams ought to be choſen, becauſe he is determined, during his adminiſtration, to adopt a national religious platform? Are you arrogant enough to aſſert this?---- But whether you do, or not, the application of your arguments amounts to it. You ſay, that Mr. Jefferſon is oppoſed to a Religious Teſt, and, being ſo, is not worthy the Chair of Preſident. Does it not then follow, by a parity of reaſoning, that Mr. Adams is in favour of a Religious Teſt, and therefore is worthy of it?

Your arguments, Decius, prove ſo much againſt yourſelf, that it is needleſs to expoſe them. You attempt to calumniate Mr. Jefferſon, but what you ſay in oppoſition to him, if intended to apply in vindication of Mr. Adams, is greatly unfavourable to him. For his honour and reputation, I hope ſuch an application will not be made. Would a Quaker, Baptiſt, Congregationaliſt, Univerſaliſt, Unitarian, vote for Mr. Adams, if they ſuppoſed that what you alleged againſt Mr. Jefferſon was approved by him? Are you ſo ignorant as to think, while you are condemning Mr. Jefferſon for giving every ſect the freedom of conſcience, that you are helping Mr. Adams by ſuggeſting that he is oppoſed to this privilege? However you may cloak your deſigns, yet, upon

fair ground, drawn from your own premiſes, the concluſion is, that you are in favour of Mr. Adams in expectation of ſuch an event.

As a friend, Decius, I would adviſe you to deſiſt from proſecuting your publications; for depend on it, your arguments are injuring, rather than favouring Mr. Adams. You will ſoon raiſe an oppoſition from a quarter you little ſuſpect, and their clamours will ariſe from thoſe documents which yourſelf have furniſhed.

An injudicious friend, is the worſt enemy;—and you may reſt aſſured, Decius, that your publications will go farther towards the election of Mr. Jefferſon, than any hitherto exhibited to the public. You have ſo unſkilfully wielded your weapon, that it will finally recoil upon yourſelf. Mr. Adams's friends will *curſe you*, and Mr. Jefferſon's friends will *laugh at you*. You will become the ſport, not of a *ſmall*, but of a *large party*, "at a future day." You will find, in the courſe of a few numbers, that you have furniſhed me with weapons to lay you, and your deteſtable junto, proſtrate.

No. XVI.

PLOTS! PLOTS! PLOTS!

To the Author of "The Jefferſoniad," in the Centinel.

YOUR lucubrations have become ſo deficient, both in argument and decency, that even to notice them requires an apology to the public. *Your obſervations* are unworthy a ſerious refutation; but at preſent I ſhall make uſe of you, as a *common ſewer*, to carry off the filth, which has been collecting under the auſpices of a deſperate *tory junto*. They have become, in a political ſenſe, as deſtructive as the yellow fever, and require a *national* "*board of health*," to purge the country of their peſtiferous infection.

Though my numbers are addreſſed to you, yet I would not flatter you ſo far, as to lead you to ſuſpect that I conſidered *your remarks* on Mr. Jefferſon as having a tendency to leſſen his character—They ſavour too much of the eſſence of Billingſgate to excite the attention of the candid; and are too deficient in argument to proſelyte any man who values his literary reputation.

Leaving you, Decius, out of the queſtion, I ſhall go on to obſerve, that the variety of meaſures adopted by the *tory junto* in this country, for the four years paſt, are worthy the particular conſideration of the WHIGS, at the preſent criſis. Every contrivance which ſtratagem could deviſe, or intrigue fabricate, has been fraudulently practiſed on the unſuſpicious citizens, to effect their baſe purpoſes; a deep-laid ſyſtem of deception has been purſued, and the moſt low tricks uſed, to intimidate the cautious, and terrify the ignorant. Every little dirty manœuvre has been ſo artfully managed, that the paltry efforts of a faction have ſucceeded to accompliſh a temporary advantage. At one time, a TUB-PLOT was ſounded as the toſin throughout the United States. The terror was ſo univerſal, that every old woman expected to find treaſon and rebellion wrapped up in a bundle of linen; and the contents of a *waſhing-tub* were inſpected with as much accuracy, as the entrails of birds and beaſts in the days of augury.

This *tub mania* operated with wonderful ſucceſs, till at length it gave way to a more myſterious TAILOR-PLOT. To uſe a vulgar expreſſion, "the devil was to pay among the tailors." All the *croſs-legg'd* fraternity (as if touched with the wand of Harlequin) were *cried down*, as being employed to make uniforms for an army of jacobins, who were (it was ſaid) to join the French on their landing in America. This induſtrious *thread-and-needle* brotherhood were generally ſuſpected to be in league with France, to aid Bonaparte in his deſcent on the United States. Every tailor's ſhop in Philadelphia was conſidered as "pregnant with evils", as the belly of the Trojan horſe; and was viewed as the rendezvous of a banditti of "*wild Iriſhmen*," who had enliſted in the ſervice of the French Directory. The *tailor-plot* was ſo terrific, that, inſtead of beholding *honeſt Buckram, nine degrees below par*, he was magnified to a political Falſtaff; his needle an Herculean wand; and his ſhears a guillotine, beſmeared with the blood of martyr'd federaliſts. Little David, with his ſling and ſtone, was not ſo formidable to Goliah, as the tailors in Philadelphia, with their gooſe and bodkin, to the government of the United States. —Thus were thoſe honeſt, induſtrious citizens ſtigmatized by a junto, as the enemies of their country.

The *tailor-plot*, however, paſſed over as harmleſs as the morning dew, and the next ſcene preſented was a LADY-PLOT. In this

part of the tory drama, every danger was apprehended. A woman! a woman! was all the cry. A French *man* and a French *woman*, tub-plots, and tailors, were repreſented as forming an alliance of the moſt formidable nature; a *woman* was to ſet fire to the magazine, and the Preſident, Senate, and Houſe of Repreſentatives, with the Hon. Theodore Sedgwick at their head, were to ſhare the fate of King, Lords and Commons, under the fatal exploſion of Guy Faux, with his dark lanthorn. The whole government of the United States was to aſcend towards Heaven in columns of ſmoke, and the Conſtituted Authorities were to riſe to the ſame elevation in chariots of fire.

Theſe ſeveral Plots, however, did not ſucceed ſo fully, as to anſwer the purpoſes of the tory faction. At length, Mr. Harper contrived to tie a *bundle of plots* together, which he emphatically chriſtened "CLUES TO CONSPIRACIES." He exhibited them to Congreſs, in as much order as a Connecticut trader would a bunch of onions. As occaſions offered, he could *wind off* a ſkein of "Clues," with as much facility as a country girl would a ſkein of ſtocking-yarn. Theſe "Clues to Conſpiracies" were advertiſed in Fenno's, Porcupine's, and ſome modeſt papers in Boſton, as diſcoveries which would inevitably blow up the jacobins. The tories were on tip-toe to ſee the whole club in the air; and were as pleaſed with the idea, as ever the Duke of York was, to find himſelf out of the reach of the French army. "Harper's Clues," however, ſoon became like the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion, and he and his ſupporters ſunk into that contempt, which their folly and ignorance merited.

Plots! plots! at length loſt their efficacy. The people got wearied out with ſuch nonſenſe and abſurdities; and the tory junto, being baffled in their projects, had recourſe at laſt to the deſpicable inſignia of a COCKADE. In this part of the farce, they appeared more ridiculous than ever. To ſee a group of old men, ſwaggering through the ſtreets, *en militaire*; and a cluſter of boys, ſinging the *formidable ditty* of

> "*When I was a* little boy, *my mother kept me in,*
> *But now I am a* great boy, *I'm fit to ſerve the king,*"

interſperſed with a few ſtraggling negroes; with a huge throng (to

fill up the chaſm) of ſycophants, who were courting public favour, exhibited a ſcene which naturally excited the laughter and pity of every conſiderate citizen. This COCKADE-influenza was rather harmleſs, as folly was the only conſpicuous trait which marked its progreſs—Only one blot remains on it, which was, the cowardly action of tearing a *tri-coloured one* from the hat of an *invalid* Frenchman; but as we know the man and his co-adjutors, who were guilty of this diſgraceful action, it is an apology for the ſtigma attending the tranſaction.

The tory junto, in this ſtage of the buſineſs, got to their *ne plus ultra*; ingenuity was exhauſted. They ſtood at bay for ſome time, till they hit upon an expedient to rouſe their drooping ſpirits. RELIGION! RELIGION! was in danger;---an *Illuminati* was about to *darken* the Chriſtian world;---Deiſm, Atheiſm, and every other evil was about to take place among mankind. Some of the reverend Doctors of Divinity were on fire to extirpate the pernicious Society; and they wrote in the public papers ſo many abſurdities, that all their rhapſodies became the ſubject of ridicule, and themſelves the objects of deriſion.

Thus, for theſe four years paſt, have the citizens of the United States been impoſed on by a tory faction. Alarms, terror, threatenings, and fraud, have been the weapons by which they have aſſailed the good ſenſe of the people. Every ſpecies of impoſition has been practiſed to accompliſh their wicked purpoſes: thoſe whom they could not *coax* they intimidated, and thoſe they could not *intimidate* they coaxed. They have purſued ſo deteſtable a ſyſtem, that they have been afraid and aſhamed to encounter thoſe who had ſpirit and reſolution to challenge them to an explicit conteſt. They have acted the part of aſſaſſins towards their opponents, by attempting, in an inſidious manner, to injure them in their buſineſs, and aſperſe their characters. No meaſure, however baſe and infamous, has been neglected by this deſperate junto, to *raiſe themſelves*, and *depreſs others*. But, thank God, they are fruſtrated in their deſigns; and we truſt in heaven, that the time will ſoon arrive, when the perfidy of ſuch adverſaries will be as conſpicuous to the public as their baſeneſs is deſpiſed by their opponents.

Plots, Illuminati, Ocean maſſacres, &c. having loſt their efficacy, the tory faction are now watching the motion of the waters in

the enſuing election for Preſident. Their laſt reſource is, to calumniate Mr. Jefferſon as an enemy to the Chriſtian religion. The ſame perſons who have hitherto deceived the citizens about tub-plots---who have propagated the LIE of the Ocean maſſacre, are now buſy in ſcandalizing Mr. Jefferſon. They have worn out every other falſehood, and are now reduced to the miſerable ſubterfuge of calling him an atheiſt. The fact is, Mr. Jefferſon in his writings vindicates the *right of conſcience on the ſubject of religion*, while his antagoniſts are planning in conclave, to erect a national hierarchy, to control and tyrannize over every other religious eſtabliſhment. This muſt be the caſe, otherwiſe it is impoſſible that ſo much virulence ſhould appear againſt him, for attempting to place every ſect on an equal footing. Judge then, fellow-citizens, between Mr. Jefferſon and his opponents.

The deceptions which have been practiſed on the public, and the falſehoods propagated by thoſe whoſe duty it is to ſtudy the TRUTH, have had a great tendency to deſtroy the morals of the people, and to render them inattentive to the precepts of the goſpel. When they find ſo many of the Clergy deceiving them with fooliſh political tales, the people begin to doubt the validity of thoſe doctrines which they preach and enjoin. When they obſerve more zeal to propagate political, than evangelical principles, the people ſuſpect, that the apparent ſanctity of ſuch Clergymen is more a cloak of hypocriſy, than a garb of piety; more eſpecially when they find, that falſehoods delivered in the pulpit are not rectified even after the preacher is convinced of the fallacy of his aſſertion. Common honeſty dictates to a certain Reverend Doctor, that he ought to acknowledge his error on the Ocean maſſacre. It is to be feared, that a few overheated eccleſiaſtic partizans, have done more injury to the cauſe of Religion, than all the deiſtical or atheiſtical writers either in France, England, or America. A few leading Clergymen have ſhown ſuch an intolerant ſpirit---have acted and preached with a temper ſo unbecoming the mild catholic precepts of the goſpel, that many ſerious perſons have become ſo far diſaffected, as to neglect an attendance on public worſhip. The pulpit in many inſtances has been a political theatre, and days ſet apart for religious worſhip, have been converted to party rant, and defamation. The ſociety inſtead of being entertained or inſtructed

in matters of religion, have been enraged againſt each other by the inflammatory dogmas of the preacher.

This ſubject is ſo copious, I ſhall appropriate another number for a *more ſerious* diſcuſſion.

No. XVII.

DR. MORSE ON THANKSGIVING AND FAST SERMONS.

WHILE conſidering the "*decay of religion and morality*," ſo generally complained of among the enemies to Mr. Jefferſon, it is proper to inſert the following quotation from Dr. Morſe's Geography, which may lead us to judge of *one cauſe* of their decline—viz.

"There is one diſtinguiſhing *characteriſtic* in the religious *character* of the people of New-England, which we muſt not omit to mention, and that is the cuſtom of annually celebrating FASTS and THANKSGIVING-DAYS. This pious cuſtom originated with our venerable anceſtors, the firſt ſettlers of New-England, and has been handed down as ſacred through ſucceſſive generations of their poſterity. A cuſtom ſo rational, and ſo happily calculated *to cheriſh in the minds of the people a ſenſe of their dependance on the* GREAT BENEFACTOR of the world, for all his bleſſings, it is hoped will ever be ſacredly preſerved."

A ſentiment of this kind, coming from the Doctor, it is natural to ſuppoſe would have had a proper effect on his mind on thoſe anniverſaries. Inſtead of leading his audience to ſpeculative points of politics, in his faſt and thankſgiving ſermons, we might expect that his diſcourſes would have a tendency "*to cheriſh, in the minds of the people, a ſenſe of their dependance on the* GREAT BENEFACTOR *of the world, for all his bleſſings.*" Inſtead of becoming a fiery zealot as a *politician*, we ſhould conjecture he would have been more conſpicuous as a *divine*. His ſermons, on theſe occaſions, have been more calculated to light up the torch of perſecution, than to inculcate the benevolent principles of the goſpel; they have been more congenial with the anathemas of a pope, than the mild perſuaſions of a diſciple of our Saviour. He has not only wrote ſermons *to preach*, but has increaſed them to an enormous bulk, *for publication*. His *appendix* has ſometimes been longer than

his original discourses; and the advertisements, *for the sale of them*, seemed more calculated to inflame the community, and to set neighbours at variance, than to promote that peace and good will which are inculcated in the scriptures. His pretended list of Illuminati, containing a number of outlandish names, may have excited the curiosity of the public, so as to make it *a catch-penny work*, but how far the imposition balanced the profit, is left for him to determine. An intolerant ecclesiastic, is of all characters the most to be dreaded; not that I would judge too illiberally of the Doctor's intentions; but if any thing has been published by him, as a FACT, which afterwards turned out an egregious *falsehood*, he is bound in duty (as an honest man) to make a public confession of his crime. As a *Christian teacher* he would not wish to give circulation to so barbarous a story as the Ocean massacre, under all the sanctity of a pulpit performance, and yet be backward to acknowledge the falsity of the narrative. As a *clergyman*, who is giving, in his Geography, a "distinguishing characteristic of the people of New-England, in their observance of fasts and thanksgivings, which (he says) "is so happily calculated to cherish a sense of our dependance on the GREAT BENEFACTOR of the world," it cannot be supposed that he would be desirous to blast such an institution, by printing a sermon on this occasion containing a falsehood of the blackest nature. If he is honest (as no doubt he is) we candidly hope that this Reverend Divine will, ere long, make an humble confession of his fault, and publicly retract every observation which he has made on this fabricated story. This conduct would be honourable, and I cannot but please myself that he will soon give this specimen of his integrity. Many of his friends have expected to see it in print before this time; but an apology has been given, that his various other cares, in collecting materials for his Geography, &c. have hitherto prevented its appearance.

These remarks on the Reverend Doctor would not have been so particular, had he not signalized himself so often in political controversies, and published so many hard things against others. But, as *reason* is *now* taking place of *declamation*, it is best to bring him to that point, in which he may shew his sincerity to the best advantage. The times require an explicit conduct; and, in order to try the validity of professions, an appeal should be made to the consciences of those who profess to take "TRUTH for their guide," and

RELIGION "for their object." The touchstone of religion is, to acknowledge a fault after having committed it. Charity may cover a multitude of sins, but cannot hide the deformity of wilfully persisting in error. A man must cast out the beam in his own eye, before he attempts to pull out the mote which is in his brother's eye. Unless this is done, it will not do to talk about Illuminati, deism, atheism, or the decay of religion, &c. First let him shew his own veracity, and he will then feel a confidence in judging on other men's faults. If such an error had been committed in his Geography, he would have been bound in duty to rectify the mistake; and, in candour to the Doctor, it must be acknowledged that he wishes to stand with equal reputation as an *evangelical*, and as a *geographical* author. Will calumniating Mr. Jefferson, as an infidel, atone for the impiety of affronting the Supreme Being, by returning thanks, "that though we have lost a *Washington*, yet we still have an *Hamilton*"? Hypocrisy itself must blush at such duplicity.

The mode, in which our Fast and Thanksgiving Days has of late been celebrated, by some of the Clergy, has had a tendency to destroy that religious character, which distinguished our venerable ancestors. Those days originated from that pure principle which ought ever to govern a people professing godliness. They were set apart for the express purpose, "*to cherish in the minds of the people a sense of their dependance on the* SUPREME BEING." But if we examiue the sermons, preached for four or five years back, how greatly deficient are they on this point? The people have assembled on those occasions, but how small a part of the sermons has been directed to this purpose? Politics, instead of religion, has generally been the theme for contemplation. The mind of the audience, instead of being solemnized to adore the SUPREME BEING for all his mercies, has been convulsed with party controversies. The preacher, in many instances, has exhibited more the attitude of a *dictator*, than the solemn deportment of a Christian minister. The congregation has been greatly disturbed by the inconsiderate behaviour of the priest; and the society have separated with as much personal irritation, as if they had been attending an electioneering town-meeting. Fast and Thanksgiving Days have been converted to days of strife, and the social circles have often been rendered disagreeable by the disgusting conduct and political

dogmas of a vindictive bigot. The GREAT BENEFACTOR OF THE WORLD has been but a secondary object, and the *names of men* have been oftener mentioned than the name of GOD, or JESUS CHRIST. The fact is, such an outrageous impulse has been excited, that some persons could scarcely walk the streets without being insulted. Fast and thanksgiving sermons were made political engines to propagate particular sentiments. They became a mere traffic, and were hawked about the streets like play-bills or quack-medicines. The papers were filled with advertisements of fast and thanksgiving sermons; the clergy seemed embodied, and the press groaned with new editions of Morse, Osgood, and Dwight, and even a *Gardner* vented his venomous spleen, shrouded within the pale of the sanctuary. Fast and thanksgiving days were days of political controversy; some of the clergy took the field, and their pulpits mounted as many guns as a first rate man-of-war. The pews of certain individuals were so particularly aimed at, that the persons were almost obliged to raise a *breast-work*, to screen themselves from their clerical assailants. Fast and thanksgiving days were, in a great measure, assumed as the privileged periods, when fiery zealots arraigned their congregations, to receive a sentence of condemnation for the deeds done as citizens and freemen; the culprits were summoned, and the reverend judge inflicted his punishment, under all the terror which naturally attaches itself to a sacerdotal anathema. When the congregation was dismissed, instead of hearing any thing which related to the business of the gospel, each one went away "*wagging his head*," and insulting his political antagonist. Amidst this torrent of political phrenzy, to the honour of many gentlemen in the profession, they omitted politics, and led their audience to adore that BEING, by whom all blessings come.

I would not be thought unreasonably severe in my remarks, but I can appeal to my fellow-citizens for the TRUTH of them. In a cool moment it is best to recapitulate these circumstances, as reflections on the unwarrantable behaviour of *some* Clergymen, may be of service to them in their future conduct; neither do I wish to censure *them* too rashly, but when they have been guilty of such improprieties, a plain statement of their "zeal without knowledge," may lead them to a *reformation*, if not to *repentance*. If their feelings are hurt by a revision of their proceedings, how do

they think thoſe whom they have cenſured were able to ſtand the ordeal of their vindictive deciſions? It is but a fair retaliation, that they ſhould receive a few of thoſe laſhes which they have ſo unmercifully beſtowed on others.

The proſtitution of Faſt and Thankſgiving days, from thoſe pure principles which actuated our pious forefathers, has been a primary cauſe of the decay of religion. The people in too many inſtances have found them uſed by the clergy to improper purpoſes. The minds of the *aged* have been ſoured and imbittered, while the *young* have been led to contemplate them only as ſet apart for political controverſy. Inſtead of piety and devotion, politics have been conſidered as the ſubject to arreſt the public attention, which naturally excited an indifference and inattention to every religious conſideration. The worſhip of the Supreme Being, has ſcarcely formed a trait of our public diſcourſes; inſtead of adoring HIM, we have blaſted the French Directory---inſtead of returning HIM thanks, we have abuſed each other----inſtead of praying for a bleſſing, we have curſed thoſe who differed from us. Society almoſt ſeemed rent aſunder; contentions and bickerings, inſtead of love and unity, were too often the productions of thoſe ſolemn ceremonies. Why then are we to look to *French philoſophy*, or Mr. Jefferſon's writings, for the *decay of religion?* Let us look at home, and inquire whether the *cauſe has not ariſen among ourſelves*, and from a ſource, from which we had a right to expect better things. Religion is conſtructed of the pureſt and moſt refined materials; an unſkilful profeſſor, though placed in a conſpicuous ſtation, may deſtroy its comelineſs and deform its features: it requires the moſt delicate management, otherwiſe it receives more incurable wounds from its advocates, than from its moſt inveterate enemies. The garb of religion is of the moſt exquiſite texture, and it may eaſily be torn aſunder by thoſe who attempt to wear it. A fiery zealot, in lighting up the torch to enforce it, endangers the ſyſtem to a general conflagration. The mild precepts of our Saviour is the oil which burns in the lamp, and thoſe who purſue a different courſe are the "fooliſh virgins" who are deſtitute of this vivifying ingredient. Though ſuch perſons may ſay, "I have eaten and drank in thy preſence," yet the denunciation, "depart from me," will fall on thoſe who have violated their ſacred functions, and proſtituted them to

worldly purpoſes. Whilſt the benevolent principles which are inculcated by Mr. Jefferſon, to *give every man the right of conſcience*, will be applauded, the fanatic reviler, who is willing to torture a man into his own creed, will be reprobated as an impoſtor, and an enemy both to God and man. May the religious of every ſect think on theſe things.

No. XVIII.

CATHOLICISM.

To the Author of "The Jefferſoniad," in the Centinel.

IF our newſpapers were confined within the territory of the United States, there would be no occaſion to anſwer the many groſs abſurdities which appear againſt Mr. Jefferſon. But as they circulate in Europe, ſome reply is neceſſary to remove the ſtigma which otherways might be attached to them. A gentleman who has for ſo many years received the honours of his country, and been ſo highly reſpected by his fellow-citizens, cannot at this time require the aſſiſtance of his friends to vindicate his reputation. At the trying period of our revolution, he ſtood conſpicuous both as a patriot and ſtateſman. Among the worthies which adorn the pages of the American hiſtory, his name is enrolled with diſtinguiſhed approbation and applauſe. Ever uniform and conſiſtent with thoſe republican principles which ſuſtained America during her conflict with Britain, he has now brought on himſelf the curſes of APOSTATE *whigs*, and the anathemas of profeſſed tories. Theſe men ſicken at his virtues, eſpecially thoſe, who are baſking under the ſunſhine of *lucrative offices*, and are ſharing a large proportion of the money ariſing from the taxes of the people. *The degenerate ſons of freedom*, are appalled at his magnanimity, and view with aſtoniſhment, that he has not, like themſelves, ſacrificed his political integrity, to his perſonal emolument. A Samuel Adams, and a Thomas Jefferſon ſtand on that eminence of political rectitude, which diſtinguiſhed them before the pecuniary means of government had a charm to violate their former profeſſions. They ſtill view the people as entitled to rights of which no conſtituted au-

thority can disarm them, and they feel those attachments to preserve the liberty of the citizens, which led them to defend it against Britain, and her tory satellites. Honour, and distinctions are no lures with them, to annul those blessings which America so dearly earned, neither has their elevation so far raised them above their fellow-citizens, as to distinguish them in classes by any degrading appellation. This *equality of rights*, both as it respects *civil*, and *religious liberty*, urged Mr. Jefferson to vindicate the RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE, and to disrobe the proud hierarchy, which had prostrated every other religious denomination to the lowest stage of vassalage. Not content with freeing America from the thraldrom of Britain, he thought the work but half accomplished till he had declared the CONSCIENCES OF MEN FREE, SOVEREIGN, AND INDEPENDENT.

For this, my fellow-citizens, is this virtuous character abused; for this is he vilified and calumniated; for this noble display of catholicism he is called an enemy to his country; for giving every man a right to worship God agreeably to his conscience, he is called a deist, and by some is absurdly denounced an atheist. Because he has attempted to administer the Constitution upon the principles of *economy* and *republicanism*, he is charged as subverting its principles; because he is desirous to prevent burdensome taxes, and to make the government set light on our shoulders, he is designated as a disorganizer and friend to anarchy.

While reading the torrent of scurrility and billingsgate against him, the heart of every *real* American must palpitate with resentment; we must turn indignant on those venal columns, which are prostituted to defame the character of this first of patriots; the ghosts of Hancock and of Warren, with the host of heroes who have bled in defence of freedom, must frown with vindictive ire on such base ingratitude, and even Washington must view with abhorrence, the base treatment of *the man* whom HE *delighted to honour*. The hero of Mount Vernon knew his worth, and confided in his virtues; his talents were equal to the greatest emergencies, and his honour and integrity placed him above the groveling bias of executive patronage.

This is THE MAN, fellow-citizens, whom the *tory-faction* attempt to depreciate, to render suspicious, and to excite our detestation. They dread his virtues, and are afraid, lest in the execution of his office, he should make manifest their wicked machinations, to de-

prive us of our liberties. An hoſt of ſuch aſſailants are now active in their diabolical ſchemes, and have ſet in motion every deteſtable tool, and "*baſe-born*" ſycophant, to accompliſh their wicked purpoſes. But I truſt in heaven they will be defeated, and inſtead of a Jefferſon falling a prey to ſuch a venomous faction, we fondly anticipate the happy proſpect, when his enemies will be confounded by the approbating voice of his fellow-citizens.

To injure the reputation of Mr. Jefferſon, they have fooliſhly charged him with a deſign to *exterminate religion*, and deſtroy the *moral virtues* of the people. The writings and conduct of this gentleman are ſo contrary to deſigns of this nature, that his defamers muſt bluſh at the aſſertion. His Notes on Virginia are worthy the peruſal of the chriſtian and philoſopher. The benevolence of his heart is worthy the imitation of the moſt devout; and the accuracy of his inveſtigations muſt enlighten and inform the moſt intelligent. As an author, he is an honour to his country, and the literary reputation of America is eſtabliſhed in Europe, through the medium of his publications.

His political conduct is a great argument, that he is not deſirous to injure either the religious or moral character of the people. His oppoſition to particular meaſures is a ſtrong proof that he is for preſerving them in their primitive purity. Mr. Jefferſon has ever been oppoſed to ſyſtems, which had a tendency to produce thoſe evils which his enemies charge him. If he had a ſerious deſign deſtroy all religious and moral principles, he would have been in favour of thoſe meaſures which would have led to this fatal cataſtrophe; he would have been an advocate for all thoſe plans of ſpeculation, which ſerve to diſſipate and vitiate the mind, and lead the community to prey upon each other; he would have ſtudied a deep ſyſtem of finance, whereby a ſtock-jobber, an uſurer, and a ſharper, might defraud his neighbour; he would have planned ways and means to throw advantages into the hands of unprincipled ſpeculators, and by a *daſh of the pen*, to rob the old ſoldier of his hard-earned property, and reduce to poverty the widow and the orphan; he would have matured plans to enrich a particular claſs of men, and have ſet a ſnare to violate every tie which cements ſociety; he would have made it *faſhionable* to riot on the ſpoils of the unfortunate, and proſtrate the virtuous to the

loweſt ſtage of wretchedneſs. Theſe are meaſures which he would have adopted, if he had deſigned to deſtroy every ſenſe of religion and morality, but unfortunately for his enemies, he has ever expreſſed his abhorrence to ſuch horrid ſyſtems, as lead to theſe *demoralizing* purpoſes. As a philoſopher, he knew the human heart, and if he had a diſpoſition to introduce irreligion and immorality, he would have purſued thoſe meaſures, which had ſuch a direct tendency to accompliſh his wiſhes. More particularly would he have been in favour of a STANDING ARMY, that bane to every principle which ennobles the human mind. This would have been his favourite plan, as the moſt potent engine by which his projects could be effected. A rendezvous, for the enliſtment of ſoldiers, would have been a more powerful channel to communicate his principles, than long philoſophical diſſertations. At ſuch reſorts, the drum and fife are more forcible arguments than fine-ſpun diſquiſitions----here the paſſions are inflamed, and ſcenes preſented which ſtrike the ſenſes with the moſt laſting impreſſions. The language of a rendezvous, together with all the arts and tricks to entrap an inconſiderate youth, are allurements which lead the mind to the utmoſt ſtretch of profligacy.

The fatal effects of ſuch an eſtabliſhment have been too often felt in Boſton, and with pain have we ſeen a long train of young men, following a ſtandard in that ſtate of intoxication, which fully proved the impropriety of the means by which they were induced to an enliſtment. Such a diſplay of immorality, and irreligion muſt have been pleaſing to Mr. Jefferſon, if he was deſirous to extend ſuch ſentiments as are alleged againſt him, and he muſt have been doubly delighted, to find the *ſweeping of the metropolis* garriſoned in different towns among the honeſt and induſtrious yeomanry. The profaneneſs, and indecent conduct which are heard, and obſerved in our ſtreets, are in a great degree owing to this ſource of iniquity. To this may be attributed the *decay of religion and morality*.

If then, fellow-citizens, Mr. Jefferſon is the character he is repreſented to be, how came he to be againſt a STANDING ARMY? Can it be ſuppoſed that he was ignorant of its tendency? No; if he wiſhed to annihilate every trait of virtue and morality he would have enforced it with all the powers of rhetoric, and called on his fellow-citizens to aid the eſtabliſhment. But, on the contrary, he

ſtands among the worthies who early diſcountenanced ſuch a deſtructive evil.

AMERICANS!

Aſſume your wonted dignity-----revere the man who has thus deſerved well of his country. Let not the enemies of our INDEPENDENCE blaſt the man who penned the immortal DECLARATION, more particularly, when HE is calumniated in thoſe papers which eulogize a Suwarrow.

No. XIX.

PULPIT DECLAMATION.

AN enemy may be indulged to uſe his weapons, however weak and contemptible he may appear in the controverſy. *Decius* has quitted the field in diſgrace, and has left a feeble antagoniſt, under the ſignature of *Philanthropos*, to cover his retreat. The purſuit of ſuch an adverſary, though it cannot add laurels to the aſſailants, yet it is ſometimes beſt to ſilence the croakings of ſuch inſignificant inſects.

This *new commiſſioned general Philanthropos* (if we may judge from his diction) may more eaſily be deſignated by his *black gown* and *white bands*, that by any other profeſſional diſtinction. He appears anxiouſly concerned for the reputation of the clergy, and expreſſes the greateſt apprehenſions, leſt the *reverend appellation* ſhould be brought into diſreſpect. In the height of his zeal, he has charged me as being a calumniator of this venerable fraternity —as deſirous to depreciate their reputation—in ſhort, he pronounces me an *infidel*, and uſes other epithets equally as obnoxious.

This is a ſpecies of virulence and indecency of language ever uſed by bigots. Deſtitute of argument, they always have recourſe to *hard names* and ſcurrilous reflections—they never reaſon, but entrench themſelves within their ſacerdotals, and abuſe their opponents with every opprobrious term which malignity can deviſe or fanaticiſm ſuggeſt. Deiſt, atheiſt, infidel, defamer, diſorganizer, are weapons with which they aſſail their antagoniſts: but they are ſuch daſtards in fair open controverſy, that to confound them, it is only neceſſary to ſketch their portrait, and they are terrified at the deformity of their own features.

Philanthropos poſſeſſes the venom of a fanatic to ſuch a degree, that he diſregards both truth and modeſty. He has wickedly miſtated my arguments, and unjuſtly repreſented me as an oppoſer of the *chriſtian religion*. So far from depreciating the clergy in the character they ought to ſuſtain, I have endeavoured to draw the line between thoſe, *who violate their ordination engagements*, and thoſe who act *agreeably to them*. A goſpel miniſter and a political demagogue, are very diſtinct characters, and though both may wear a clerical badge, yet it does not require extraordinary penetration to diſcover the impoſtor.

The people, when they ſettle a miniſter, do not intend to erect a *clerical inquiſition* within the pariſh. Politics were never contemplated in the articles of a church compact. They are willing to hear *goſpel truths*, but are oppoſed to *political creeds*. A miniſter may imbibe certain doctrines of evangelical faith: having a ſpecimen of his orthodoxy previous to his ſettlement, he has a right to maintain his tenets among his *ſociety*, and endeavour to inſtruct them agreeably to the plan on which he firſt engaged in their ſervice—but politics is a diſtinct ſubject on which no previous opinion had been determined, and he has no more right to impoſe his political creed upon the people, than to enforce any other ſpeculative queſtion whatever. If he employs his time in preaching on political ſubjects, he robs the pariſh, as they never gave him a ſalary to diſcuſs controverſies of this nature. Thoſe clergymen, therefore, who have arrogated ſuch liberties, either on the Sabbath, Faſt or Thankſgiving Days, are not within the pale of the church, but muſt be conſidered as *heretics*, who have proſtituted their ſacred profeſſion, and demeaned themſelves to become the tools of a wicked and degenerate faction.

To evidence which, I will call on Philanthropos to anſwer, whether it is not highly degrading and derogatory to a *chriſtian preacher*, to entertain a reſpectable and devout audience, with a ſtory, which had no reference to the ſolemnities of the day, and which ſerved to irritate the individuals who aſſembled for religious exerciſes on a ſtated anniverſary? and further, I would aſk him, whether he can reconcile an *obſtinate ſilence* in any man, if requeſted *in chriſtian charity*, to acknowledge the raſhneſs and precipitancy of his conduct? If ſuch a man is often charging others with deceiving the public; if he has denounced particular characters, as in-

fidels, illuminati, diſorganizers, &c. muſt he not be confounded, while he ſtands a ſelf-convicted propagator of the moſt infamous falſehood? If he knows that his aſſertions in the pulpit were erroneous, and yet contemns every religious and moral obligation to rectify the miſtake, we cannot but condemn him as a deceiver, even though he ſhould pretend to advocate the truths of the goſpel, or ſhould be anxious to obtain miſſionaries to propogate the chriſtian religion.

Suppoſe Mr. Jefferſon had thus impoſed on the public? what would Philanthropos have ſaid to blaſt his reputation? How would he ring peals of anathemas againſt the author, and fill columns in newſpapers to depreciate his character? And yet, ſtrange to ſay, a *pious eccleſiaſtic*, of this deſcription, can wipe his mouth with a hypocritical ſanctity, and has the audacity to condemn others, while he ſtands pre-eminently conſpicuous for calumny, detraction, and defamation.

As Philanthropos has charged me with a deſign to injure the clergy, I am bound in duty to declare, in my own vindication, that ſo far from wiſhing to traduce their character, I feel the utmoſt veneration for them. For this purpoſe, I have placed them on that ground which was contemplated by our Saviour. I have applied his doctrines as taught in ſcripture, and mentioned his denunciation againſt *ſuch only*, as he expreſsly reprobates. If I am wrong, the ſcripture is the rule of error, as my quotations are wholly taken from this ſource. Philanthropos has charged me with a deſign to injure the clergy, becauſe I have ſaid, that the hiſtory of our Saviour was a proof of the wicked deſigns of a national hierarchy. To judge of this remark, let us refer to the Bible:—their character and conduct are thus given, viz. "That when the *chief prieſts* ſaw the wonderful things which he did, they were ſore diſpleaſed;" he reprobates their pride, "that they made broad their philactories, and enlarged the borders of their garments; that they loved the uppermoſt rooms at feaſts, and the chief ſeats in the ſynagogues, and greetings in the market places, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi;" "that the *chief prieſts* mocked him, and ſaid, he ſaved others, himſelf he cannot ſave;" "that they came unto Pilate after his crucifixion, ſaying, Sir, we remember that that *deceiver* ſaid, when he was yet alive, after three days I will riſe again."

If such things should now be said by Him of the chief priests, while exercising their hierarchical functions, Philanthropos would cry out that He was deceiving the people, and there is no doubt he would contemn our Saviour for his jealousies of the clerical establishments. But, while he was thus condemning the hypocrites of those days, we do not find that *his disciples* were displeased with his conduct, or censured him for exposing the wickedness of an ecclesiastical fraternity. At that period, the long-robe gentry were fulminating the curses of the altar against him, and his humble followers; HE and they were stigmatized as men, who were "turning the world upside down;" the hirelings of the church were vociferous in their anathemas, and the temple of Ephesus was proclaimed as tottering to its centre; the friends to our Saviour were persecuted, and the apostles were exposed to every insult, and finally fell martyrs to their integrity. Stephen, when stoned, was opposing the hypocrisy of priestly bigotry; and even St. Paul declares that "he received his authority from the *chief priests*," on his sanguinary errand to Damascus. Among the thousands converted by Him, and his apostles, there does not appear *one priest* among the number.

To sum up the whole evidence of the Bible, it is clear, the *chief priests* were the persecutors of our Saviour during his residence on earth; *they* arraigned him at the tribunal; bribed Judas Iscariot to betray him, and afterwards laughed at his repentance; *they* insulted him at the cross; charged him with being a *deceiver*; persecuted his disciples, apostles, and followers, and at length commissioned Paul to "pursue them to strange cities."

These particulars I mentioned in my former number, and for this I am accused by Philanthropos as a defamer of the *whole order of clergy*. My authority is from scripture, as it respects a *national establishment*, and while I can appeal to this document, the frowns of a few clerical bigots will be disregarded.

I freely make this declaration, that I am a friend to the clergy, in the character contemplated by our Saviour; but in any other, they are on a level with other men, and if they enter into political controversies and endeavour to influence the people in their elections, they quit their clerical station, and must expect to receive in return as *plain dealing* as they give to others.

No. XX.

CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS.

THE numberleſs abſurdities of Decius, in oppoſition to Mr. Jefferſon, render him ſo ridiculous, that in order to anſwer him a man is obliged to condeſcend to *frivolities*, which are degrading in a free country, even to treat with civility.—As a ſpecimen of which, I will bring before the public an argument on which he is fooliſh enough to lay the greateſt ſtreſs of his reaſoning. He ſays, " that previous to the adjournment of Congreſs, a Caucus was held on the buſineſs of deciding on a Preſident and Vice-Preſident; and that Mr. Adams and Mr. Pinckney were agreed on as candidates" ; and, to *enforce his argument*, he exclaims, " how unreaſonable would it be for the people to fruſtrate this deciſion."

Merely to ſtate this circumſtance is ſufficient to fruſtrate ſuch an unconſtitutional and unwarrantable proceeding. It ſcarcely admits of a comment. It is too degrading to be ſeriouſly noticed, and yet Decius has the folly to offer this plea as a *concluſive argument*, why the citizens of the United States ought to accede to this determination.

If any thing will rouſe the freemen of America, it muſt be the arrogance of a number of members of Congreſs to aſſemble as an *Electioneering Caucus*, to control the citizens in their conſtitutional rights. Under what authority did theſe men pretend to dictate their nomination ? Did they receive ſix dollars a day for the double purpoſe of *caucuſſing* and *legiſlating ?* Do we ſend members to Congreſs to *cabal* once in four years for Preſident ? or are we arrived to ſuch a pitch of congreſſional influence, that what they decide on is to be binding on the United States ? Is there any paragraph in the Conſtitution which gives them ſuch an authority, or even countenances ſuch a proceeding ? After Congreſs have accompliſhed their legiſlative buſineſs, have they a right to dictate in the choice of an executive ? If ſo, what an impoſition on " the people" to talk about the freedom of election ; or what conſequence is it that the State Legiſlatures ſhould concern themſelves in the mode of chooſing electors ? If a Congreſs Caucus is to decide, we have only to inquire who the man is in whom they have

agreed, and notify him of his appointment. Why should we be at the expense of calling the Legislature together to choose electors, for according to Decius' reasoning the choice of President and Vice-President is already made ? He tells us that they have agreed to vote for Messrs. Adams and Pinckney. If this is the case, let the Governor of each State only acknowledge these two gentlemen, and leave it solely to Congress to dispose of them.

It is full time that "the people" had fully ascertained their elective privileges; and if they mean to be led by Congressional or Legislative Caucusses, it is best the business should be openly acknowledged. For though an appeal to the citizens on this question might appear too abrupt, yet the system lately adopted comes very near to the same principle.

There appears of late a deep design to sap the elections of the people by the various manœuvres of a particular set of men. In the first place, we are called on by Decius to vote for Messrs. Adams and Pinckney, because a junto in Congress had previously determined on it; in the second place, an attempt was made in the Senate to place the choice of a President within the control of a select committee in Congress; in the third place, the people have been deprived of their usual mode of voting for electors, because the Legislature have assumed this right to themselves. These combined circumstances are certainly alarming, and ought to be checked in their early stages; otherwise it will become an *acknowledged right* in the Legislature to control the elections, and the constitutional liberties of the people, will, in consequence thereof, fall a sacrifice to such baneful encroachments.

The argument of Decius, therefore, so far from operating in his favour, ought to be reprobated as a high violation of the rights of "the people." If we admit his reasoning as conclusive, we may as well burn the Constitution and submit all our privileges to the individuals in Congress. The people have only to fold up their arms and set down quietly as the contemptible vassals of a domineering aristocracy.

But, thank God ! there still remains a spirit which ought ever to actuate Americans. The Constitution yet stands a sacred pledge of the liberties of America. We feel too strong an attachment to its preservation to suffer any body of men to destroy its vital energies. It is the ark of political safety, and may the ven-

geance of heaven purſue the man who dares touch it with unhallowed hands. The freedom of election is the palladium of liberty, and while we exerciſe this right we may defy the power of tyrants and the intrigues of faction. The people of the United States place themſelves on this mount, and on its permanent baſis they reſt the happineſs of ſociety. It is of no avail to them to hear that a majority of Congreſs have determined on a Preſident or Vice-Preſident; they turn over the leaves of the Conſtitution and find it therein written, that THEY have a right to chooſe their electors, unbiaſſed by the deciſions of any aſſumed power whatever. This is an interference with the conſtituted authorities, (THE PEOPLE) which demands the moſt pointed reprehenſion, and the men who have been guilty of ſuch a profane breach of truſt deſerve the execration of the public.

The inſolence of Decius in preſuming to mention the determination of the members of Congreſs, muſt be placed to his ignorance; he forgot he was writing to FREEMEN; he forgot he was addreſſing men who were acting under a Conſtitution in the capacity of INDEPENDENT CITIZENS; he forgot that his appeal was to thoſe ENLIGHTENED ELECTORS who felt their own dignity and importance on this intereſting queſtion. What! Decius!! are you daring enough to arreſt the votes of Americans, by telling them that their *ſervants* in Congreſs have already decided the choice!! Are you ſo abandoned as to ſtab the Conſtitution to its vitals, by checking the free exerciſe of the people in their ſuffrages? *If you are* thus deſperate, may their deciſions give a leſſon to deter in future ſuch imperious conduct.

No. XXI.

OBSERVATIONS ON ARISTIDES.

IT is a melancholy truth, that a *faction* in this country have been able to purſue a ſyſtem of political meaſures, which has plunged it into a moſt ſerious and alarming ſituation. This inſidious junto have had the addreſs to palm themſelves on the unſuſpecting citizens, as the friends to government, and have had the effrontery

to designate their fraternity with the emphatical appellation of FEDERALISTS. Their impudence has been so outrageous, that they have had the audacity to brand every man with the epithet of *Jacobin*, who presumed to exercise a right to arraign their conduct before the tribunal of an impartial public. But heaven, in mercy to an injured people, has confounded their devices, and placed them in a predicament somewhat similar to Milton's fallen angels, in accusing and condemning each other.

How long have the citizens been imposed on by the disgraceful tales fabricated within the circle of these caballing associates! How many patriots have been sacrificed to promote their detestable purposes! How many characters have been wantonly sported with to exalt them to the highest elevation! and how many honest men have been degraded, to raise the satellites of this party to places of honour and profit.---Yes, fellow-citizens! we have seen the evil effects of this unprincipled combination, and this country has now to deplore its unhappy situation, in consequence of the fatal policy adopted by those, who have too long trespassed on our patience and confidence. It is rather singular, however, that every assertion made by those, who are styled *Jacobins*, are proved to be facts, by the very men, who have been most forward to denounce them.

It is a distressing reflection, that the stratagems and intrigues of a number of unprincipled individuals should have so far succeeded, as to bring America to its present crisis. If the mischiefs had expired on the discovery of their designs, or their baneful effects had ceased to operate on the divisions among themselves, we might now contemplate the subject with some degree of composure; but their measures have been "pregnant with evils," and their names will long be execrated, in consequence of the misery entailed on this abused country. If it is true, that "Mr. Hamilton is the principal instrument in exciting an unfounded alarm, and producing measures which put the country to unnecessary expense"; that "he addressed the citizens of the United States on the necessity of raising an army, and endeavoured to convince them of the danger of invasion, when it was altogether chimerical, and almost morally impossible"; that the main object, in establishing this army, was to crush every domestic opposition, and eventually to "*give a government to this country by force*"; that he proposed an

eſtabliſhment of 50,000 infantry, and 10,000 cavalry; that he is the "father of the military ſyſtem," and that his influence has been ſuch, as to force the government into this unneceſſary meaſure, contrary to the wiſhes and recommendations of the Preſident. If theſe charges can be ſubſtantiated, then the controverſy wears a ſerious aſpect.

This, however, is the character drawn of General Hamilton, by the author of a Letter addreſſed to him, under the ſignature of Ariſtides, and ſuppoſed to be written by *Noah Webſter*, Eſq. If he is falſe in his ſtatement, let Mr. Hamilton contradict his aſſertions. While contemplating this ſubject, in the extenſive ſphere thus deſcribed by Ariſtides, it riſes to a magnitude which muſt rouſe the attention of every friend to America;—that he ſhould be able to effect a military ſyſtem, contrary to the ſentiments of the executive; that he ſhould have ſuch a control over the chief magiſtrate, as to carry plans in oppoſition to his wiſhes; that he ſhould throw ſuch an enormous expenſe on the people, by exciting an unfounded alarm, and at length come forward, in the face of the *public, and abuſe* the Preſident for preſuming to act contrary to his will and pleaſure. In this point of view what muſt we think of Alexander Hamilton? Where is the American, who ever thought, that within ſo few years after the adoption of the Federal Conſtitution, that the government of the United States would have been ſo far proſtrated to the ambition of one man? What! are the people of the United States to be burdened with a debt of millions, to diſcharge the expenſes of an army, raiſed *in oppoſition to the judgment of the Preſident?* Does the Conſtitution recognize any other perſons than the Conſtituted Authorities, or have the people any other means than to arraign the real culprits to the bar of an injured country? What other atonement can be made, for the millions expended by the intrigues of ſuch unprincipled individuals, or for the falſe alarms excited by their arts and ſtratagems? —In a free country, the inquiry ought to embrace the extent of the evil, as the conſtitution never ſubſtituted a *ſcape-goat*, or aſſigned a city of refuge to the men whom it held *reſponſible.*

Ariſtides, after deſcribing Mr. Hamilton in the manner before recited, introduces another important tranſaction, in which he ſays, "many influential characters in government were engaged, particularly *Timothy Pickering*, late ſecretary of ſtate." This meaſure was no

leſs than "*a treaty offenſive and defenſive with Great-Britain.*" In this part of the buſineſs, Ariſtides introduces a ſingular aſſemblage of characters, viz. the Britiſh Miniſter and *Peter Porcupine*; the *latter*, in particular, "propoſed and urged an offenſive and defenſive treaty between the United States and Great-Britain." He further alleges, as a fact, "that Porcupine was an *Agent of the Britiſh Miniſtry*, and correſponded with the under Secretaries of State": and to top the climax, Ariſtides aſſerts, "*as a well known fact*, that he had won over to his intereſt, the *Government-Paper of the United States.*"

Here, reader, I muſt beſeech you to pauſe, and reflect on the precipice over which our country has been ſuſpended! Conſider ſeriouſly the dreadful gulph into which we were threatened to be plunged. While we think on this ſubject, we cannot but tremble at our own ſituation. The foregoing recitals, on the conduct of men, are not the vague declamations of perſons who are deſirous to diſorganize and convulſe the government, but they are documents taken from a writer, who declares himſelf "too long the faithful ſervant of his country, to incur the ſuſpicion of apoſtacy," and who has written in vindication of Mr. Adams, in anſwer to Mr. Hamilton. This man tells the public, *as matters of fact*, "that Hamilton *was the father* of the military ſyſtem"; "that it was adopted by his inſtrumentality, and contrary to the inclination of the Preſident"; that Pickering, and other influential characters, were deſirous of a treaty offenſive and defenſive with Great-Britain"; "that the Britiſh Miniſter ſtood ready to cloſe the fatal contract"; and, ſtill further, "Peter Porcupine had urged the meaſure, and had ſo far corrupted the ſtreams of public communication, as that he had won over the ſtate paper of the government." Are theſe things true, as aſſerted by this author? I do not pretend to ſay they are, but they certainly require ſome explanation from the parties.

Gracious heaven! !—Is is poſſible, that America ſhould be reduced to ſo humiliating and degrading a poſition? That an army ſhould be raiſed by deceiving the conſtituted authorities, by whoſe ſanction alone it could have been brought into exiſtence? But the degradation increaſes in its ignominy, when we find that a *Britiſh corporal* ſhould have the effrontery to proſecute his plans by the ſecret agency of the Britiſh Miniſtry. Thus the Executive

was deceived to raiſe an army, while Porcupine had, by his addreſs, ſecured the patronage of the governmental printer. A hopeful ſtate truly, for the free, ſovereign, and independent States of America.

Ye ſpirits of Hancock, Warren, and Montgomery! if, in the regions of bliſs, the concerns of your country arreſt your attention, how muſt the pleaſures of heaven be allayed, to learn the abaſement of your country! How muſt indignation fire your ſouls, to find that a *wretch*, ſo debaſed as *Cobbett*, ſhould be employed by individuals, to accompliſh the wicked deſigns of involving us in war, and that he ſhould obtain ſuch an *aſcendancy*, as to pollute the ſtreams of public information! How changed ſince the days of our revolution! when even GEORGE THE THIRD, with his hoſt of troops, were baffled by the patriotiſm and integrity of the free born citizens of America; and when a *contemptible corporal* and his accomplices would have been hiſſed out of the country, with every mark of deteſtation and diſgrace. The contraſt is too humiliating, to dwell any longer on the ſubject; but I truſt that the flame of our revolution will not be extinguiſhed by the *weakeſt engine* of the Britiſh nation. On the preſent emergency, may THE PEOPLE rally round the CONSTITUTION, as the mount on which their political ark is to ſettle with permanency. In this intrepid attitude of FREEMEN, may they check their enemies, and finally place them in that debaſed ſtation in which they have attempted to put the independent Citizens of America!

AMERICANS,

"Let then all that is *party* be obliterated, and let all that is AMERICAN appear"; may it *appear* in that effulgence, as to blaſt the *ignis fatuus* of a faction, who wiſh to ally us with Britain: May the American citizens embody in a PHALANX, and counteract, with perſevering reſolution, the machinations of thoſe who are planning our ruin.

No. XXII.

APPEAL TO THE CLERGY.

"THE ſnare is broken and we have eſcaped," has of late been an expreſſion of *thankfulneſs* in our public devotions; but, while

we adore the SUPREME BEING for his mercies, it behoves us to watch thoſe who have attempted to deſtroy us. The tory faction, who have long been planning a ſyſtem of extermination, as it relates to France, have been equally as aſſiduous to connect the United States in an alliance with the oppreſſive government of Britain. This party have wiſhed to bring the two countries into a ſolemn league and covenant, and have been daring enough to riſque the peace, happineſs and independence of America, on the uncertain and convulſed ſtate in which Britain is now plunged. This alliance is as unnatural as winter with ſummer; notwithſtanding her parade of energy, yet the immenſity of her debt on the commencement of a peace, will unavoidably throw her into paroxiſms of diſſolution.

A young government like America, to ally itſelf with Britain, is of all things the moſt abſurd and ridiculous;—a nation, in its vigor, to attach itſelf by treaty, to follow all the ſpeculative and deſperate projects of one ſo peculiarly circumſtanced as the Engliſh, muſt be conſidered by every reflecting man as injudicious and impolitic. However anxious ſome are for their ſucceſs againſt France, yet the United States have more to dread from the impoſition on their commerce by the Britiſh, than from any other power in Europe. Have we experienced that friendſhip from her, that America can feel an attachment for her welfare? Has ſhe reſpected our neutrality, during the preſent war, even though we have ſacrificed our intereſt by a diſgraceful treaty? Did ſhe exhibit ſuch patience, magnanimity, and generoſity towards us, during our revolution, that we can confide in her friendſhip, *in caſe ſhe ſucceeded againſt her European enemies?* The OLD TORIES and APOSTATE WHIGS may ſay YES! but *their judgment* is not the criterion in the preſent queſtion. I would rather apply to the citizens of America, who have experienced the vindictive temper of Britons, Heſſians, and Waldeckers; I would rather apply to thoſe, who ſaw the flames of Charleſtown, Portland, Norfolk, &c. who experienced their cruelty on board the guard ſhips at New-York; who wept over the houſes of worſhip, diſmantled of their ſteeples, pulpits, pews, and ſacramental tables; whoſe feelings were put to the torture, in obſerving the ſanctuary converted to an equeſtrian theatre; who heard the profane language of a ſoldiery, within the temple which had long become venerated by the preſence of a

Prince, and the benedictions of a Sewall; to those, who were accustomed to the pleasing voice of a Whitfield, when the *Old South* was crouded before the sun had streaked the eastern horizon. These are the characters to whom I would make my address; especially at this period, when RELIGION, pure and undefiled Religion, is brought forward as the test of patriotism. What say ye, citizens of New-England?—Ye CLERGY, what is your opinion?—Ye men of piety, in holy orders, what confidence can you place in those who have so grosly and impiously profaned your houses of worship, and who disturbed your devotions on the day set apart for public worship? Can the ministers of the gospel now become the friends of those who have shewn such a disposition of enmity to that BEING whom they adore? After driving the flock from their wonted pastures; after introducing *beasts* for sport on the altar where the *souls of men* were prostrated before the majesty of heaven; after polluting the courts which led to Zion's gates with every obscenity which could disgrace human nature—can ye, *ye ministers of the gospel*, embrace the perpetrators as the friends of God, or to the cause in which you have engaged? Such an unnatural alliance is affronting to heaven, and must in the end be reprobated by some evident marks of its displeasure.

The minds of the Americans have been inflamed on the subject of *religion*, and directed to anathematize the French as the only subverters of this sacred institution. But what nation has ever been so hostile to the principles of this country as the British? From the first settlement of America, has not the hierarchy of the church been attempting to annihilate the independency of our religious establishments? Why did a Mayhew and a Chauncy enter the field of controversy against the assumed rights of National Episcopacy? Why did those religious patriots encounter the spiritual weapons of bishops and their host of hireling scribblers? Why were they blasted as disorganizers in their sacerdotal professions? The answer is plain, because they opposed those who wished to "lord it over Christ's heritage."

During the revolution this spirit was evidenced in the most striking colours; our *Presbyterian meeting-houses* were the peculiar objects of resentment; they were styled *Schism-shops*, and every shaft of calumny and detraction was directed against their supporters; scarcely was a town entered by the British troops but the

houſes of worſhip experienced their particular violence. In the town of Boſton the inhabitants can recollect the large proportion which fell a ſacrifice to their hoſtilities. Their conduct was ſo vindictive, that it ſeemed a war of *religious extermination*, and they placed our *Preſbyterian* worſhip in ſuch a ridiculous point of view, that they wantonly aimed at thoſe houſes which were diſtinguiſhed for the veneration of the men who had preached within them. Dr. Sewall was eminent throughout the world for his piety, and therefore they choſe to ſignalize his ſanctuary for the moſt degrading amuſements; they continued in their impiety till the old gentleman ſtalked before them, in the attitude of an injured ghoſt.—The *Old North* was diſtinguiſhed by its venerable characters, and this ancient fabrick was deſtined to the flames. Many other places of worſhip (excepting the *Epiſcopalian*) were defiled by their unhallowed hands. Our Sabbaths were days of military parade, and the higheſt contempt was ſhown for every thing which wore the appearance of religion and morality; drums and fifes were the interludes to our devotion.

Fellow-Citizens! Is this too high a wrought picture of Britiſh proceedings in this country during our revolution? Ye aged patriots, I can appeal to you for the truth of the deſcription: Ye venerable matrons, I can call on you for the propriety of the obſervations: Ye miniſters of the goſpel, ſome of whom now ſlumber on your poſts, I will even venture to ſummon you as evidences to the foregoing ſtatement. If I am wrong in my narration, come forward and deny the facts; but if I am right, you muſt accede to my principle.

Where is the American then, who wiſhes an alliance with England, to defend either our civil or religious rights? But it has lately been declared, that "many influential characters in the government" have been deſirous to accompliſh this meaſure. On the preſent occaſion, however, it may not be impertinent to inquire whether thoſe perſons are not the friends to Mr. Pinckney? Are they not deſirous to make him Preſident? Is he not the man who is the object of this particular party? It is true, he may not favor their deſigns, but we ought to be jealous of the candidate, who is ſupported by men of this deſcription. Is he not patronized by the Eſſex Junto? And while we deteſt their politics, we muſt be careful of the man whom they recommend.

Unwarrantable jealousy is derogatory to an enlightened people; but there are points of decision to which wise men will adhere. The crisis is important, and it calls on every considerate citizen to weigh *consequences*. If we mistake our situation, or become lulled into security, by the deceptive appellations of *federalists* and *jacobins*, our ruin is inevitable. Our government must depend on the wisdom of its administration, and the economy of its expenditures. An extravagant system must impoverish the people; enormous taxes must press hard on the industrious citizens; eight per cent. loans will increase the public debt beyond the ability of those who will be called on to discharge it. Let us then throw aside party spirit, and contemplate the man whose whole political conduct has been opposed to such measures: *Who this man is*, we have the strongest evidences; as the abuse of Mr. Jefferson has solely arisen from his decided disapprobation of every *religious tyranny*, and his desire to administer the government on the pure and ECONOMICAL *principles of republicanism*.

Americans! this being the state of the question, can we halt between two opinions? Let us act like men, and exercise our rights as becomes the descendants of "*well-born*" Americans. The evidence of being "*well-born*," is to *preserve our freedom*. When this is permanently effected, then may we exclaim with pleasurable emotions, "the snare is broken, and we have escaped!"

No. XXIII.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE NORTHERN STATES.

IN order to give a specimen of the *tendency* of your proceedings, I shall exhibit the character of Mr. Adams as described by Mr. Hamilton; after revising this *portrait*, you may be able to draw proper inferences of your conduct.

Mr. Hamilton says—"Mr. Adams does not possess the talents adapted to the *administration* of government; he has intrinsic defects in his character, which *unfit him for the office of Chief Magistrate*"—"he is a man of an imagination sublimated and excentric—propitious neither to a regular display of *sound judgment*, nor to

ſteady perſeverance in a ſyſtematic plan of conduct ;" and, ſays Hamilton, " I began to perceive, what has been too manifeſt, that to theſe defects are added the unfortunate foibles of a vanity without bounds, and *a jealouſy capable of diſcolouring every object.*" Mr. Hamilton goes on, " the conſiderations which had reconciled me to the *ſucceſs of Mr. Pinckney*, were of a nature excluſively public ; they reſulted from the *diſguſting egotiſm, the diſtempered jealouſy, and the ungovernable indiſcretion* of Mr. Adams's temper, joined to ſome doubts of the correctneſs of his maxims in adminiſtration"— " it will not appear exaggeration to thoſe who have ſtudied his character, to ſuppoſe that Mr. Adams is capable of being alienated from a ſyſtem *to which he has been attached, becauſe it is upheld by men whom he hates.*" Speaking of the American miſſion to France, he thus deſcribes Mr. Adams, " ſometimes he has treated with *ridicule* the idea of its being a meaſure which would *terminate in peace* ;" at other times, " that he has vindicated the meaſure, as one conformable with the general and ſtrong wiſh of the country *for peace*, and as likely to promote that deſirable object."

This is the character given of Mr. John Adams, by Mr. Alexander Hamilton—and can any thing be more diſhonorary and affronting ? *Outrageous paſſions, jealouſy* and *duplicity*, are repreſented as the prominent features which mark his political portrait. While Mr. Hamilton thus defames Mr. Adams, he is equally as elaborate in his eulogiums on Mr. Pinckney.

Now, gentlemen, I would beg leave to aſk you, with what propriety you could connect Mr. Adams and Mr. Pinckney in your votes for Preſident and Vice-Preſident ? Was there one man among the electors in the four New-England governments, who knew any thing about Mr. Pinckney, otherwiſe than by the character given him by Mr. Hamilton ? And provided he had not been nominated by him, whether you would have thought of this gentleman in connection with Mr. Adams ? You muſt excuſe me if I ſay, that I very much doubt it. If this is the caſe, what could induce *you* to take up with the nomination of Mr. Hamilton, who had ſo ſeverely treated Mr. Adams, and attempt to give Mr. Pinckney *an equal (if not a ſuperior) chance* with him ? This was an alliance of the moſt unnatural kind ; for if Mr. Adams was in the leaſt degree ſimilar to what Mr. Hamilton had repreſented him, he was not deſerving of your choice, and yet you have *reprobated* his opinion as

it reſpected Mr. Adams, while at the ſame time you have *approbated* his nomination of Mr. Pinckney. How could you ſuppoſe that any cordiality could ever ſubſiſt between the gentlemen thus choſen: One was *denounced* by Hamilton as unfit for the office, and the other was the candidate of his warmeſt approbation. Certainly Mr. Pinckney would feel an obligation to *his patron*, and while in office would attempt to promote his political meaſures—Mr. Adams, on the contrary, being wounded by the cenſures thrown upon him, muſt ever be placed in a moſt diſagreeable ſituation, to act in concert with a man, who obtained his votes by the recommendation of his opponent. Provided ſucceſs had attended the election of theſe two gentlemen, Mr. Adams would have been "of all men the moſt miſerable." He would have been mortified beyond expreſſion, to ſee the man *of Hamilton's nomination* in the firſt ſeat of government; or if he *perchance* had obtained it, yet the problematical ſucceſs of the election between them, would have produced feelings, which the tenderneſs of his mind could not eaſily have eradicated. Mr. Hamilton would have exulted over him, and might poſſibly *threaten* Mr. Adams as to the event of his next election.

Suppoſe that Mr. Pinckney had obtained a majority of votes, and was choſen Preſident, what would the northern ſtates have ſaid to this buſineſs? Would they not have ſeen that they were *duped?* Would they not have diſcovered the artful plot, and would not every citizen have been chagrined at ſuch an event? Yet, gentlemen, you came near to give this triumph to a party, who were laughing behind the curtain at the game they were playing.

Sampſon's *fire-brands and foxes* were not a more unnatural alliance, than Pinckney and Adams, and it is probable that a "ſmall party" calculated to produce as much miſchief. After Mr. Hamilton had deſcribed Mr. Adams in terms ſo opprobrious, he could not ſincerely wiſh him to be Preſident.

This may be good policy, but I muſt confeſs it is beyond my comprehenſion. As friends to Mr. Adams, the candidate of Hamilton would have been the laſt man to be conſidered. It ſeemed a *pointed reflection* on both to bring them in contact. The connexion muſt have been ſo diſagreeable, that I ſhould ſuppoſe no friend of either would wiſh to have forwarded it. But the fact appears plain, that many who pretended to be the advocates

for Mr. Adams are his greateſt enemies. They *bolſtered* up Pinckney by the ſtrength of Adams; and this is evident, for at the late feaſt of the deſcendants of the Pilgrims, in this town, we ſee by the toaſts the *real ſentiments* of certain individuals. Hamilton is ſtyled the *pure gold*, though deprived of his *official ſtamp*; what is this but a direct implication on the Preſident for his diſmiſſal? If then we find particular perſons extolling him for his *purity*, notwithſtanding his late attack on the Preſident, can we heſitate to declare, that ſuch men are HYPOCRITES, when they pretend friendſhip towards Mr. Adams?

Excuſe me, gentlemen, for theſe plain remarks—I have not ſtudied elegance in diction, but I profeſs frankneſs in expreſſion. The citizens will judge of the propriety of my remarks; and as I write for *their information*, apologies are unneceſſary. I do not cenſure you in your official capacity, but I muſt ſay, if you are friends to Mr. Adams, that you took a ſtrange method to expreſs your attachment.

The ESSEX JUNTO, that bane to our country, have thrown us into our preſent difficulties, and occaſioned our inconſiſtencies and perplexities. They have calumniated Mr. Jefferſon, and every honeſt republican throughout the United States; and Mr. Adams, in his retirement, will have an opportunity to reflect on thoſe deluſions, which thoſe who have been ſtyled jacobins, cautioned him againſt. But we truſt in heaven that the deſigns of this faction are fruſtrated, and that the ſnare is broken and we have eſcaped.

No. XXIV.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE NORTHERN STATES.

REPUBLICANS poſſeſs that magnanimity of mind, that they ſcorn to avenge themſelves of their adverſaries, by retaliating on the ſordid principle of perſonal reſentment. Though for many years paſt, they have been expoſed to the inſolence of every petty ſycophant, who was ſeeking a maintenance from the federal government; though ſingled out as objects of popular odium, by the deteſtable tools of an Eſſex faction; though vilified from the preſs, and denounced from the pulpit; though perſecuted, defamed, and

libelled by every ignorant ſcribbler, who could wield his pen in oppoſition to the liberties of his country: yet, amidſt this torrent of invective, the REPUBLICANS ſtand pre-eminent for their moderation, and feel ſuch a ſuperiority as will not ſuffer them to retort the pitiful and ignominious ſcurrility, which characterize their calumniators.

The REPUBLICANS wiſh not to ſcreen themſelves from a ſtrict inveſtigation of their conduct. They place themſelves on the baſis of the Conſtitution, and never dread an appeal to the public judgment, by threatening men with fines and impriſonment. Under the ſyſtem of a pure *republican adminiſtration*, we hope never to hear the groans of a priſoner echoing through the receſſes of a dungeon, for expreſſing his political ſentiments; nor to behold a wife and children bemoaning their misfortunes, by being deprived of the ſupport of an huſband and parent under the cruel hand of a relentleſs judiciary. Such exceſſes are abhorrent to *well-born* Americans.

The republicans depend on PRINCIPLE, and not on TERROR. The human mind is left unſhackled, and permitted to contemplate in its utmoſt latitude the conduct of *men*, and the tendency of *meaſures*. They aſſume no control over public opinion, nor deſignate a particular party by the childiſh inſignia of a black cockade. Theſe degrading actions are beneath the philanthropy of republicans. They ſtrive to convince, rather than to terrify. They appeal to the *reaſon* rather than the *fears* of their fellow-citizens: and if theſe ſalutary purpoſes are not effected, by theſe moderate meaſures, they pity and commiſſerate the obdurate. A gaol is not the temple of Apollo to convince the mind, and fines and impriſonment are arguments too unphiloſophical to be offered as *rational conviction*. Magnanimity, benevolence, and moderation are the cardinal virtues; and may the cauſe of republicaniſm never be diſgraced by any ſpecies of conduct which deſignates tyranny.

After thus giving the outlines of republican tenets, I hope you will acquit me of exciting a ſyſtem of terror under the new adminiſtration. Though an oppoſite line of conduct has hitherto been purſued by the oppoſers of the republicans, (the ſeverity of which might juſtify an ample retaliation) yet the brilliancy of the cauſe in which they are engaged, I hope will never be clouded by imitating the degrading and diſgraceful behaviour of a ſet of inſolent, intolerant, inſulting, and abuſive wretches, ſome of whom have

been basking under the emoluments, and feeding on the loaves and fishes of government. Though the principles of republicanism soften the vindictive passions, yet they tend to the most critical scrutiny into all the motives and operations of their public servants. No man, or body of men, is considered *above* "The People"; THEY are the Alpha and Omega of power; they are the "checks and balances" which poise the political standard, and elections are the *weights* by which they decide merit.

These things being premised, gentlemen, I cannot but make a few more observations on the *tendency* of your conduct in the choice of President and Vice-President.

The consequences must have been fatal, had you succeeded in the election of Messrs. Adams and Pinckney. It might have been setting up two standards, to which the different parties would have repaired. The enemies of Mr. Adams knew this, and therefore urged their plans under the expectation of reviving their own party. They knew that they could not expect any preferment under Mr. Adams's administration; they therefore artfully linked themselves with Mr. Adams's friends, and, with the utmost subtilty of address, so far ingratiated themselves as to walk hand in hand like two fond lovers, towards the consummation of their designs. But their friendship was delusive; it might be compared to the assassin who had enticed the traveller to depend on his protection, and after obtaining his confidence, sacrificed him the first opportunity. All the expectations of this junto rested on the success of Mr. *Pinckney*, and if *he* did not succeed, they were satisfied that their plans were frustrated. To carry him under his own political reputation, they knew was impossible; they therefore stood ready to couple him, either with *Adams* or *Jefferson*:—and I am confidently told, that a proposition was made by Mr. Pinckney's friends for this purpose; but the supporters of Mr. Jefferson treated the compromise with every mark of contempt; they would not barter the general happiness to bring forward a party, which they considered as injurious to the general welfare, though it would completely secure the *election* of their candidate. Mr. Jefferson might have had a great support from Mr. Pinckney's friends, if his advocates had solely studied his elevation to the presidential chair, in preference to the *real republican principles*, which they meant by his election to substantiate.

As an evidence in point, of the impropriety of connecting Meſſrs. Pinckney and Adams, I will ſtate a circumſtance which would probably have taken place, in caſe Mr. Pinckney had been choſen *Preſident*: and, as *you* gave him an *equal chance* with Mr. Adams, the event cannot be conſidered as altogether viſionary. Suppoſe the firſt nominations of Mr. Pinckney had been Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Pickering, one as Secretary of State, the other Secretary at War? In this ſtage of the buſineſs, the wound inflicted by Hamilton would have been laid bare before the public; the friends of Adams would have conſidered it as a pointed affront on him; and the friends of the candidates would have viewed it as a juſt compliment to their merits. During this controverſy, parties would have rallied; reflections would have increaſed with an electrical celerity; the honour of Mr. Adams on one ſide, and the jealouſy of Mr. Pinckney on the other, would have created a fermentation in the public mind, which could not eaſily be allayed; the Eſſex junto would have erected their baneful creſt, and the event would have been, if not a *civil war*, yet the inveteracy of paſſions would have fell but little ſhort of ſuch a cataſtrophe. The conteſt might have been ſo diſtreſſing, that the hiſtory of America would have furniſhed a datum whereby to calculate our political misfortunes. The contending parties being powerful, the United States might have commenced the ſanguinary detail of war, from this inauſpicious period. The nineteenth century might have begun its progreſs with garments rolled in blood, within the once peaceful ſhores of America. Hiſtory, inſtead of being crimſoned with European controverſies, might have opened a new page to deſcribe the ſanguinary ſcenes exhibited on the American theatre.

Theſe recitals are not the whims of fancy, or the flights of imagination; they are probabilities which no man can controvert; and we have reaſon to thank heaven, that we are delivered from ſuch apprehenſions, under an adminiſtration ſo congenial with *uniform principles*.

Theſe obſervations, gentlemen, are offered for your conſideration—and the citizens have reaſon to rejoice, that the election has taken its preſent courſe—and provided "THE PEOPLE" are attentive to their adminiſtration, we may anticipate events the moſt ſalutary and propitious.

Thus, gentlemen, have I offered my sentiments on the *tendency* of your votes, in paying attention to an inconsistent nomination, and if they strike *your mind* with the same force they do mine, you must congratulate each other that you did not succeed in your election; for Mr. Adams must have been the most miserable man within the United States, if chosen either President or Vice-President, under the patronage of the Essex junto. The writings of federalists, and the toasts we see drank, are but feeble specimens of what they would have done, provided this party had been brought once more into our public councils. "May they henceforth rest from their political labours, and *may their works follow them.*"

No. XXV.

TO THOSE WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

THE ESSEX JUNTO being completely baffled in their views, and finding that all their arts and stratagems are defeated, have now become desperate, and are endeavoring to confound and perplex that government by *artifice*, which they could not subvert by *intrigue*. These men are now reduced to the most mortifying situation, in seeing themselves disappointed in their designs, and after anticipating the most glorious prospects, they cannot refrain expressing their chagrin in being arrested in the midst of their career.

Thus we observe the continued calumny in the presses devoted to their service. Every indecency of language and every opprobrious epithet are expressive of the malignity of their disposition. They have the impudence to charge the republican citizens as aiming solely to acquire *posts of honour and profit;* when it is evident that a large proportion of these defamers are either enjoying places of profit or are constantly seeking some lucrative employment.

With what bare-faced arrogance must these persons presume to allege such motives to the citizens who have given their suffrages for Mr. Jefferson. The *substantial property* of this country is in favour of this patriotic gentleman by the present election. Their votes are not obtained by fraudulent means, in voting for one man, when another was evidently intended. Notwithstanding this une-

quivocal decision in their favour, yet this implacable faction are persisting in their nefarious schemes to throw the United States into perplexities. They have dared to call their opponents *disorganizers, enemies to the constitution*, and disposed to depreciate the public confidence in all matters respecting the *funds*, and other pecuniary establishments.

These are the charges brought by this faction against the friends of Mr. Jefferson. Let us then, fellow-citizens, see how far their actions correspond with their allegations.

Who are the disorganizers at the present moment? Who are the men that talk about *overturning government?* Are they not those who are pleading in favour of an hereditary President and Senate? Are they not those who are calumniating the states which have given their suffrages for Mr. Jefferson? If these persons are in favour of the constitution, why will they not allow the same right to others, which they claim themselves? The constitution contemplates a free election for President and Vice-President, once in four years, and on this occasion every freedom is to be exercised by the respective states, to choose such men as are most agreeable to them. The mode adopted at the last election has been peculiarly favorable to Messrs. Adams and Pinckney, notwithstanding which, the return of votes has given the majority to Messrs. Jefferson and Burr. If this does not express the sentiments of the citizens, what method could be taken to give them a more decided avowal? Massachusetts has taken the right from the people for the express purpose of securing Messrs. Adams and Pinckney; and Pennsylvania have carried their projects to the utmost length to effect their purposes; who then is to blame in this business?

Though this is so evident, yet we daily observe the most gross abuse on the *public voice*. The vilest calumny is published against Mr. Jefferson, as they know that *he is the man* contemplated by the electors to fill the seat of presidency. To defeat *this purpose*, is now their great object. The Essex junto and their adherents, therefore, are the *disorganizers;* they are the disturbers of the public tranquility; they are the men who are endeavouring to depreciate the public funds, to lessen the value of all pecuniary establishments, to create jealousy among the citizens, and to injure our national reputation in Europe. For this base end, they are describ-

ing our government as tending to a diſſolution ; that property will be ſet afloat ; that our ſix per cent. and other public ſtocks are falling.

Ye holders of the public funds, what have you not to apprehend from theſe diſorganizers ? How are you to receive your quarterly payments, if the confidence of the citizens in the government is thus blaſted ? From whence do you expect your intereſt money, if this junto are to raiſe a diſtruſt in the new adminiſtration ? If your ſtocks are to be *cried down* by this deſperate party, who are the people to give ſtability to your property ?—*Will the junto help you in the day of adverſity ?* If they convulſe the government, will not your pecuniary intereſt be the firſt ſhaken in the controverſy ? Inſtead, therefore, of joining this deſperate clan of oppoſers, rather ſuſpect their views and deſigns. It may be for their private emolument that confuſion ſhould ariſe. Individuals among them may be ſo plunged in arrears, (provided a ſtrict examination into their accounts ſhould take place) that their only ſecurity may lay in *burning the books*, and involving all public tranſactions in intricacy and perplexity. Such men, we may ſuſpect are *afraid* to have things brought to light, and under their preſent embarraſſments may be deſirous to introduce every difficulty to prevent a critical inveſtigation into their conduct.

The men who have been planning a war with France are not the friends to any claſs of *real American citizens*. In this ſtate of things, if they had accompliſhed their purpoſes, the *ſtocks*, and every kind of LANDED PROPERTY muſt have fell a ſacrifice. It would have been impoſſible to maintain the funds at their preſent eſtimation, as the public debt would have increaſed beyond the ability of the people to diſcharge it. The ſchemes of this junto were hoſtile to every man who held either public ſtocks or landed property, as war muſt have leſſened the value of both. And it is further ſuſpected, that many who are now clamorous againſt Mr. Jefferſon are ſo involved in the banks, cuſtom-houſe, &c. that they wiſh to balance their accounts by an annihilation of the government.

The utmoſt confidence, therefore, muſt be placed in the *new adminiſtration*. A war with France is now improbable, if not impoſſible. A ſyſtem of ECONOMY will give ſtability to the funds, and appreciate the landed intereſt. The merchant will not be burdened with exceſſive duties to maintain a ſtanding army and a clan of

idlers, who have too long lived on salaries much above their *service*, or *their merits*. ECONOMY is the great work of reformation :— The industrious are the worthy part of society, and the lazy drones who are basking either at home or *abroad*, under governmental patronage, ought to be put to a better employment. ECONOMY is the vital principle of a republic, and under the administration of Mr. Jefferson, we doubt not, the citizens will have reason to return thanks to heaven, that the "snare is broken and that we have escaped." A desperate, insidious, wicked faction are now discovered (emphatically styled the ESSEX JUNTO) and provided we keep such men from our councils, and remove them from their offices, the Republic of America will assume its national dignity. These are the disorganizers, and ought to be branded as such. Citizens of America, be firm ; be vigilant.

No. XXVI.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE, FROM DR. MORSE'S GEOGRAPHY.

DOCTOR MORSE, in his Geography, page 453, speaking of the clergy of *Connecticut*, makes this singular remark :—"The clergy, who are numerous, and as a body very respectable, have hitherto preserved a kind of *aristocratical balance in the democratical government* of the State, which has *happily* operated as a check to the *overbearing spirit of republicanism*."

This assertion, if *false*, is a charge which requires the consideration of the CLERGY : If *true*, the declaration is worthy the immediate consideration of the PEOPLE. If it is *false*, it is a libel on the "*respectable* clergy" of Connecticut : If *true*, it is a subject in which the citizens are deeply interested.

In a republican government, it is an alarming idea, that an aristocracy is operating among the clergy to check the spirit of republicanism ; and the alarm is greatly increased, when the declaration is made by a man, who pledges the authenticity of his avowal by subscribing his name to the publication.

Doctor Morse's Geography is passing current through the United States. He is an author, who has obtained a reputation

(if not by the propriety of his writings, yet his *own aſſiduity* has given a circulation to them) which has overpowered many inaccuracies contained in various pages of his performances.

Doctor Morſe has taken peremptory ground. It is preſumed, then, that he is willing to be reſponſible for whatever his Geography contains. If it is ſtudied in our academies, public ſchools, &c. every article ought to be well authenticated. If our children are to be taught not only *geography*, but the *political principles which govern certain orders of men*, how careful ſhould he be, that nothing is inſerted but what will bear the ſtricteſt ſcrutiny.

By this ſtatement, the queſtion is reduced to a ſimple point,—do we wiſh that our children, by peruſing Doctor Morſe's Geography, ſhould be taught as a rudiment of education, "That the reſpectable body of clergy in Connecticut, are a kind of *ariſtocratical balance* in the democratical government of that ſtate, and that they operate as a check to the *overbearing ſpirit of republicaniſm ?*"

Will the clergy of Connecticut thank Doctor Morſe for this declaration ? Do they wiſh to be conſidered as oppoſed to a *republican ſyſtem* of government ? Are they deſirous to become an ariſtocratical check in the civil eſtabliſhment of that ſtate ? Are church and ſtate ſo allied among the free citizens of Connecticut, that the *clerical order* is introduced as an efficient branch of the adminiſtration ? Does their conſtitution contemplate the *clergy* as part of the legiſlature, or have they a control over the "conſtituted authorities" eſtabliſhed in their ſovereignty ?

What right has Doctor Morſe (while writing a Geography for his *perſonal emolument)* to bring into public view the clergy of Connecticut, as interfering in the civil departments of that Commonwealth ? Who gave him an authority to repreſent this reſpectable order as an *ariſtocratical body*, and acting in oppoſition to the *republican principles* of their fellow-citizens ? Who empowered him to denounce the freemen of Connecticut as exerciſing *an overbearing ſpirit of republicaniſm ?* Or will the *ſale* of his Geography (as it reſpects his *private intereſt)* compenſate the reſpectable clergy of Connecticut for the *cenſure* thus thrown upon them ?

While reading this remark of Doctor Morſe, a ſtranger would naturally ſuſpect that the clergy of Connecticut had formed themſelves into a civil phalanx : that inſtead of attending to the *duties of their profeſſion*, they had aſſociated as a body of politicians ; that

they *voted* and *acted* in oppoſition to the legal authority of the ſtate; that they iſſued their veto or bulls to counteract the reſolutions of the legiſlature; that they forſook their pulpits, and commenced political miſſionaries; in ſhort, that the clergy had combined as an *eccleſiaſtical faction* to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed principle of the government. If a *zealous republican* had dealt ſo freely with the Reverend Order, it might have been conſidered as an outrage on their patriotiſm, but when one of their own fraternity makes the avowal, it wears a more ſerious aſpect.

Not being particularly acquainted with the clergy of Connecticut, I cannot pretend to ſay, how far the repreſentation of Doctor Morſe may be *agreeable to them*. But this I am bold to ſay, that if any man in Connecticut had made the ſame indecent declaration againſt the *whole reſpectable clergy of* MASSACHUSETTS, they would have reſented it as a moſt illiberal degradation of their clerical character. The clergy of this ſtate would have received it as a groſs reflection on their conduct; and at their *annual convention* would have paſſed a ſevere reprimand on the officious author. The clergy of Maſſachuſetts would have reprobated every ſuggeſtion that conveyed an idea *that they had formed an ariſtocratical balance, to check the ſpirit of republicaniſm*. They would have conſidered it as an affront on the *Reverend Order*, to be placed in ſuch a degrading political view, and deſignated as ſubverters of the liberties of their country. If Doctor Morſe can take this freedom with the clergy of Connecticut, it is preſumed that no man dare aſſume the ſame liberty with the clergy of Maſſachuſetts. Though we have reaſon to think, that ſome individuals of the clerical profeſſion are endeavouring to form an ariſtocratical balance, yet the clergy, *as a body*, we preſume, are oppoſed to ſuch a meaſure.

When Doctor Morſe was writing his Geography, and *hurrying it for the preſs*, he might flatter himſelf, that it was but of little conſequence how he deſcribed particular orders of men. But what he ſays of the clergy of Connecticut is a charge of the higheſt magnitude. If this ariſtocracy is already formed in Connecticut, may we not ſuſpect that it may have a more extenſive operation? Has not Doctor Morſe, by his injudicious obſervations, taken an effectual method to ſet the people of Connecticut againſt their eccleſiaſtical teachers? Does he ſuppoſe, that the citizens will *reverence* their clergy as an *ariſtocratical body?* Will they eſteem them as

men, who are a *check* to the *ſpirit of republicaniſm?* Are not the people of Connecticut REPUBLICANS? If ſo, they muſt be oppoſed to an *ariſtocratical body;* and when they are told by Doctor Morſe, that the CLERGY ARE THIS BODY, will they not view them with jealouſy, and endeavour to render them uneaſy in their reſpective congregations?

What can have a greater tendency to deſtroy the cauſe of religion, than denouncing the *whole clergy of a ſtate* as a *combined body of ariſtocrats?* A deiſt could not take a more effectual way to accompliſh his purpoſes; and yet the *pious* Doctor Morſe is prejudicing the citizens of Connecticut againſt their clergy by ſuch an opprobrious epithet. The PALLADIUM is bemoaning the progreſs of infidelity; the *New-England States* are particularly called upon to rally round the banner of religion; and yet this ſage Doctor has come forward, and declared, that the clergy of one of theſe ſtates, "*happily*" preſerve an *ariſtocratical* balance, and check the ſpirit of republicaniſm. The Doctor, it muſt be allowed, ſhows ſome degree of jeſuitiſm in his mode of expreſſion; he ſays, "*an overbearing ſpirit of republicaniſm.* But who are the judges in this caſe? Are the clergy ſo far a branch of the government as to interfere in the laws? or have they ſuch an influence as to control meaſures, after they are enacted by the legiſlature? Do they meet in conclave to *reviſe the laws?* or are they recognized as LORDS SPIRITUAL? Can they rally a *faction* to counteract the proceedings of the conſtituted authorities?—But, according to Doctor Morſe's ſtatement, all theſe things are done by the Clergy, and that it is in their power to *check the ſpirit of republicaniſm*, as far as THEY THINK PROPER.

CITIZENS OF CONNECTICUT!

Theſe remarks are made for your conſideration. Permit me to aſk you, whether Dr. Morſe is *right* or *wrong?* Is it a fact, that your clergy are an ARISTOCRATICAL BODY? Is it *true*, that they check the ſpirit of republicaniſm? Have they ſuch a control over your councils, that they can ſay, hitherto ſhall you go in your republicaniſm, and no farther? Have you a bench of BISHOPS, or do your laws paſs through the ordeal of a ſpiritual inquiſition? If theſe are facts, we cannot but pity your ſituation: But *if they are not*, we expect that ſome ſevere cenſures will be paſſed on the man, whoſe arrogance has led him to give ſuch a ſtatement of your po-

litical vaſſalage. The YEOMANRY of Connecticut are too enlightened to be prieſt-ridden. The freedom of their conſtitution ſoars above a clerical control; and though a man may acquire a few dollars by the ſale of a geographical publication, yet the *honour of freemen* is too great a ſacrifice not to expoſe his abſurdities. The liberties of a people are too ſacred to be ſported with, and even prieſtly habiliments ſhould never be a cover, too impenetrable for inveſtigation and reprehenſion. The federal conſtitution has guaranteed a republican government to the reſpective ſtates; who then is the MAN that preſumes to aſſert, that the clergy are forming an ariſtocracy to check this conſtitutional barrier? If there is ſuch a perſon, let him come forward and maintain his principles, and not impute to others, what he dare not himſelf openly avow.

No. XXVII.

FURTHER REMARKS ON DR. MORSE.

THE remarks on Old-South, in the PALLADIUM, carry ſtrong traits, that the *Reverend Doctor* is the author;—but when ſo high a compliment is paid to him, "that every *gentleman*, who is friendly to the diſſemination of uſeful knowledge, feels *indebted* to the induſtry and *talents* of Doctor MORSE for ſo *valuable a work*, as the Geography of his own country," candour might forbid me to conſider him as the trumpeter of his literary fame. But though candour may lay in her claim, yet we have been furniſhed with ſo many evidences of his ſcribbling propenſity, I cannot ſuppoſe that any other perſon would *take the pains* to vindicate his political reputation.

I ſhall, therefore, conſider the Doctor as the writer of the remarks on Old-South; and, after he has complimented himſelf as a "*man of talents*," I am willing to allow him the ſame privilege with any other trader, who has an article to diſpoſe of. His Geography is an article of ſale; and as ſuch, it gives it an additional value, by ſtamping on the prefatory page the talents of the author. For we buy books for the improvement of the mind, as we buy "Hamilton's worm-deſtroying lozenges," or any other medicine, for rectifying the human conſtitution. There never was a perſon

who publiſhed a noſtrum, but what declared the inventor a man of talents, and that the medicine would cure almoſt every complaint to which the human frame was liable. Though I am willing to acknowledge that Doctor Morſe has great merit as a compiler; yet in books, as in medicine, the public will judge for themſelves.

Doctor Morſe, while endeavouring to apologize for his expreſſion in his Geography, has perſiſted in his declaration, "that the ſentiment is perfectly correct." He ſtill perſiſts in his avowal, "that the clergy of Connecticut have *hitherto* preſerved a *kind of ariſtocratical balance*";—and how do they preſerve it? The Doctor tells us, "by preaching the pure doctrines of the goſpel; inculcating its moral precepts, and exemplifying them in their lives." —Thus, by the ſtatement made by Doctor Morſe, *the pure doctrines of the goſpel; its moral precepts, and walking agreeably to them, are ariſtocratical.* This is a new doctrine, for when Paul preached before Felix, he was not denounced as an *ariſtocrat*; he was conſidered rather as a *madman*. When the diſciples and apoſtles proceeded in their miſſions, it was not declared by the infidels that the *ariſtocrats* had come among them, but men who were "turning the world upſide down." The pure principles of the goſpel were never ſtyled *ariſtocracy*, before Doctor Morſe gave them this appellation:—In what inſtance did our Saviour give himſelf the character of an ariſtocrat? On the contrary, he bore teſtimony againſt every thing that led to this diſtinction, or excited the vain exclamation, "*I am holier than thou.*"

The fact is, Doctor Morſe has completely expoſed his political principles, in his deſcription of the clergy of Connecticut. It is conjectured, that he felt a diſpoſition, in 1789, to give the clergy an *ariſtocratical preponderancy* in the civil inſtitutions of the government; but finding, at *this time*, that it will not do openly to avow his ſentiments, he has recourſe to an explanation, which ſtrikes at the very foundation of the Chriſtian ſyſtem; to ſtrengthen his Geography, he weakens the Scripture. He has, in order to juſtify his mode of expreſſion, been obliged to give a diſguſting appellation to the pure doctrines of the goſpel. He has declared it a correct ſentiment, that preaching the pure doctrines of the goſpel, inculcating its moral precepts, &c. is a *kind of an ariſtocratical* inſtitution. Will *this kind of definition* help the cauſe of religion? Will its miniſters be received with alacrity, under all the apprehenſions

annexed to this diſguſting expreſſion? Will the people become zealous to propagate the pure doctrines of the goſpel, as an ariſtocratic eſtabliſhment? Doctor Morſe being thus reduced to an *explicit explanation*, as to his charge againſt the clergy of Connecticut, inſtead of acknowledging his error, has choſen rather to give an odious appellation to the doctrine of the goſpel, than to depreciate his Geography, which contains ſuch a ſevere cenſure on the reſpectable clergy of Connecticut.

Suppoſe Thomas Paine had made uſe of this opprobrious epithet, would not the clergy have conſidered it as an unfair repreſentation of the tendency of the goſpel? Would they not have reprobated the man who had attached ſuch an unpopular idea to this ſacred ſubject? The term ariſtocracy, is no way applicable to the mild, equitable principles of the chriſtian religion. Its worſt enemy could not introduce a word more injurious to its propagation. If ariſtocracy is the tendency of its eſtabliſhment, will the people be zealous in extending its progreſs? Dr. Morſe may be a warm advocate for religion, but if he means to get clear of his charge againſt the clergy of Connecticut, by throwing the odium of ariſtocracy on the pure doctrines of the goſpel, the queſtion is, whether greater injuries will not ariſe to the cauſe of religion, than benefit to the community by the ſale of his Geography?

His ungenerous aſſertion, that I have "inceſſantly abuſed the clergy," "merits no other notice than a ſmile of contempt;" ſo far from attempting to injure their reputation, I have endeavoured to vindicate them from the ſtigma which his publication tended to produce. To be plain with the Doctor, I conſider him, and a few others of the ſame vindictive diſpoſition, as wounding the cauſe of religion beyond any body of men in the United States. He has expoſed himſelf to ridicule in many of his ſermons and newſpaper publications; his ſtory of the Ocean maſſacre is degrading to a miniſter of the goſpel, eſpecially when he has tarniſhed his integrity by not acknowledging his error.

From delicacy to *his profeſſion*, I ſhall forbear commenting any farther on his remarks, as I might rouſe the citizens of Connecticut to treat him with too poignant a ſeverity. But his inſinuation, that "this ariſtocracy of manners and virtue has been in a great degree preſerved among the citizens of Connecticut, by the good

examples and moral inculcations of the clergy," is a high reflection on the people of that ſtate. "The *reſpectable clergy* of Connecticut" will not thank him for this remark; neither will the merchants or farmers of that Commonwealth reſpect him for this declaration. The clergy are too liberal to admit of ſuch a degrading idea of their pariſhioners; and the citizens are too enlightened to ſuppoſe that the clergy *(inſtead of their own good ſenſe)* have prevented them from plunging into anarchy and diſorganization.

As a friend to the Doctor, I would adviſe him to keep within his proper boundary; he miſtakes his talents if he thinks he can do his duty as a Clergyman, a Geographer, and a newſpaper Editor; any one of theſe employments is fully ſufficient for a man of his literary endowments. It is beſt for him to make his election which of them he will purſue; for depend on it, his inadequacies will appear more and more conſpicuous if he proſecutes the whole of theſe vocations. If money is his object, let him correct his Geography; if religion is his ſtudy, let him attend to his pariſh; if politics are his purſuits, let him take a Printing-Office, and openly announce himſelf as the Editor. This is my advice, as a friend.

I muſt apologize to the *Reverend* Doctor, for omitting the word "*very*;" it was wholly unintentional: But as it is of "*very*" little conſequence, I am "*very*" willing, and "*very*" much gratified, in giving the *Reverend* Doctor all the advantages reſulting from the omiſſion.

I remain, his "*very*" *devoted* ſervant, &c.

No. XXVIII.

DOCTOR MORSE—AGAIN!!!

HUMANITY pleads ſo ſtrongly in favour of Doctor Morſe, that it would be cruel to purſue him any farther. He, or ſome friend for him, is obliged to come forward and declare, "that he has never been a writer *in the Palladium.*" Is the vindication of his Geography ſo puerile, or the remarks on Old-South ſo ridiculous, that the reputation of the Doctor would ſuffer, if he ſhould allow himſelf to be the author? Are the publications in the Palladium ſo diſhonorary, that a man muſt ſuffer in his literary reputation,

if he were recognized as the author? Alas! that the Palladium should so soon sink in the public estimation. After such a display of literary patronage, under which this paper was ushered into the world; after so many private subscriptions to substantiate its establishment; after being told that men of the first abilities were invited to furnish its lengthy columns with the rarest specimens of erudition; after Dr. Morse had been peculiarly active in obtaining money from individuals, to establish this "*New-England Palladium*"; is it possible, in less than two months, the Reverend Doctor should find it essential to his literary fame, to declare, that he has never been a writer in it? Why are you thus explicit, Doctor? Do you think it fair, after getting persons to subscribe, some a hundred, and some fifty dollars, thus to leave them in the lurch, and depreciate the paper with an avowal that you have nothing to do with it? Certainly, Doctor, this is not doing as you would be done by. Do you suppose, that when the money was paid by the gentlemen to whom you applied for subscription, that they expected you would so soon have disowned their patronage? One person, I understand, signed one hundred dollars, but if he had thought you would have denied having any thing to do with the paper, is it probable he would have been so lavish in his bounty? The declaration appears ungenerous as it respects the subscribers, for it looks as if you were ashamed of the paper, though some have coaxed so much money from their pockets towards its establishment.

The evidences, however, are so strong, that Dr. Morse does furnish pieces for publication in the Palladium, that it is suspected the denial, though apparently explicit, somewhat partakes of a mental reservation. The writer says, "that Dr. Morse never has been *a writer in the Palladium*." This "*kind*" of evidence cannot be admitted, for it is out of the power of any person (excepting the Doctor himself) to make such a negative declaration. If the pieces were brought by another person, or written in another hand, yet no man can say positively that Dr. Morse was not the author. This declaration, therefore, goes for nothing. But I suspect further jesuitism still: the expression is, "Dr. Morse has never been *a writer in the Palladium*"; neither is any other man *a writer in the Palladium*; it is a *printed* not a *written* paper, and it may be declared with safety, that the Doctor's hand-writing

does not appear among the types of that paper. But will the Doctor positively say, that he never has been a *writer for* the Palladium? that he never furnished a piece for publication? If he declares this, he will say something; but at present the assertion wears a questionable aspect.

However, Doctor, for once be candid and generous; will you declare on the honour of a man, and on the *sanctity of a Christian*, that you have not, directly or indirectly, written *for the Palladium*. Equivocation and mental reservation are out of the question: say whether you have not furnished many publications, and don't be ashamed to tell the whole truth, even though your literary fame should suffer by the acknowledgment. Is it not a fact, that you spend many hours in the printing-office? Is it not a fact, that you applied to many of your clerical brethren for their countenance and support? If this be true, Doctor, why are you afraid to be considered as a writer? Has Old-South intimidated you? —Depend on it, nothing but honour and generosity will arise from this quarter; he will handle your publications with gentleness; if he is severe, yet it will be only the chastisement of a friend, who rather means to caution you in your conduct, than expose your imprudences. Your zeal has carried you beyond your proper boundary; as a Clergyman I esteem you; but as a Politician, I must honestly say, that you have done an injury to religion, and even exposed yourself to ridicule.

I shall now close *this controversy*, unless an unfair advantage is taken of my silence; in which case I may renew my observations.

Health and fraternity.

No. XXIX.

IN ANSWER TO DR. MORSE, ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

As subjects of much higher importance than *Dr. Morse's Illuminati*, &c. are now before the public, it requires an apology for noticing his elaborate observations. But, as the Doctor has given it an apparent solemnity by his prolixity, a few gentle remarks I hope will not be considered as improper.

The Doctor, with all the *humility* and *candour* of "a Minister of the gospel of peace," has styled his opponents "unprincipled men": Such an indecorous appellation does not savour of that christian spirit, which ought to characterize his profession. Charity is an appropriate attribute of religion, and it ill becomes a man to use such opprobrious language, who assumes the prerogative to ASSIZE himself the *standard of orthodoxy*.

My observations, on the paragraph taken from the Doctor's Geography, were principally intended to reprobate the idea, *that the "respectable clergy of Connecticut" were an aristocratical body*. The assertion, in my mind, conveyed a sentiment injurious to that worthy class of citizens. The remarks were introduced, not to injure the Doctor, but to give him an opportunity to *explain his meaning*. *He* has thought proper to be silent on the subject, but some friend in his behalf has made a feeble defence, and at the same time has indirectly suggested, that the Doctor has not written any thing in the *Palladium*, excepting advertisements and anecdotes.

The story of the Ocean massacre is not fully cleared up by the Doctor; for no person doubted that such a "*report*" prevailed; but, as a "minister of peace and *truth*," it was expected that when he found it was *false*, he would frankly have *confessed* the error of his assertion; that he would be as ready to *rectify his mistake*, as he was assiduous to *propagate the report* in his sermon. At least it was as incumbent on him to stand on the ground of veracity in this instance, as in that of Professor Ebeling's letter.

The wild, ridiculous story of *Illuminism*, I never pretended to investigate. This was *too dark* a business for my comprehension; but if the Doctor would condescend to publish the *real letter* which he received from Professor Ebeling, it is expected that *great light* would be thrown on this clouded subject.

Though I have never before noticed the controversy on Professor Ebeling's letter, yet after reading the laboured vindication of the Doctor, the following remarks naturally recurred from the perusal:

The *identical letter*, received by Dr. Morse, from Professor Ebeling, it is readily acknowledged, *was not the one published*; but will the Doctor say, that he had not *at the same time*, in his possession, a letter from this gentleman of the *same import*? If he had, I would ask him whether the mode, in which he *denied the letter publish-*

ed, had not a tendency to raiſe a doubt as to the *authenticity* of Profeſſor Ebeling's opinion of Robiſon? And whether this "kind" of denial does not leave a *faint ſhadow of deception* on his part? Doctor Morſe, in his letter to the editor of the Bee, (ſpeaking of the letter publiſhed) ſays, "This I can, and do aſſure you, it is FALSE; I never ſaw *the letter you have publiſhed*, till I read it in your paper." Now, Doctor, I would aſk you, whether this deciſive language did merely carry in it a denial of the letter *being ſent to you*, but whether it did not convey a ſtrong idea that Profeſſor Ebeling *had not written any letter whatever diſapprobatory of Robiſon's book?* Further, the certificate declares, that "the abſtract was *baſely falſe and calumnious*." Such a poſitive denial gave a more ſerious appearance againſt the *facts of the letter*, than againſt the trifling miſtake that it was *directed to you*.

The whole *merits* of this queſtion, Doctor, reſt on this ſingle point, whether, *at the time* you declared the letter publiſhed to be FALSE, you had not in your poſſeſſion a ſimilar one from Profeſſor Ebeling, and though the *letter publiſhed* might not contain every particular word, which could be found in the one you received, (the word "VERY," &c. might be omitted) yet whether it did not expreſs the ſame in "*ſubſtance, ſcope* and *end?* The marrow of this cauſe, Doctor, lies in this inquiry, and ten lines in the paper in *anſwer to it*, would as fully ſatisfy the public, as the columns you have publiſhed.

You acknowledge, Doctor, that you received a letter from Profeſſor Ebeling, *in July*, 1799, "in which he mentions having ſeen Robiſon and Barruel's books on the ſubject of Illuminiſm, and gives his opinion, and *the reaſons of his opinion againſt the authenticity* of theſe works"; while the note you ſent to the editor of the Bee, declaring the letter publiſhed to be "FALSE," is dated Dec. 3, 1799, five months after you acknowledge to have received Ebeling's letter. How then could the *letter be* "*falſe*," even if a miſtake was made, in ſaying it was ſent *to Doctor Morſe*, inſtead of the *Rev. Mr. Bentley?* The *contents of the letter*, as it reſpected Ebeling's "opinion, and the *reaſons for his opinion*," were the ſubjects of controverſy, not whether it were ſent to *Doctor Morſe*, or any other clerical character.

The *direction of the letter* TO Doctor Morſe, might be ſafely denied: but how could he undertake to ſay, that *the letter* was

"*false*" ? or how could any one for him say, that it was "*false and calumnious*," when he had every reason to suppose the letter to be genuine, as he held one in his own hands containing similar sentiments? The monosyllable "TO" could not alter the merits of the letter; it was true or false, not as directed "TO Doctor Morse," but in the validity of the opinion given of Robison by Ebeling; wherein was the falsity or calumny, as it related to the essence and quintessence of the letter, whether the person who published it, said it was sent to you or any other person? Robison's book was a matter of public notoriety, and the public were pleased to know Ebeling's opinion of it, and there could be no other calumny attached to Doctor Morse by this disclosure, than the difference of his opinion with Professor Ebeling's. *Great men* in all countries, and in all ages have and will disagree, without the stigma of *calumny*, and I hope, Doctor, this will console you under the mortification of finding the *learned Ebeling* reprobating a book, which you so sedulously recommend.

The Doctor alleges, that it would be improper to publish a private correspondence. This may be a very honorary apology, but will the Doctor say, that he did not write to Professor Ebeling, in *expectation that he would approbate the book*; and provided he had been furnished with such a choice document, I would ask him, whether he would not have published it with avidity, to substantiate the belief of Illuminism? Unfortunately, however, for the Illuminati votaries, the learned Professor reprobated the vagaries of Robison and Barruel, and therefore his letter was confined to a few confidential friends to lament their disappointment.

The writings of Robison and Barruel have long since been exploded by almost every literary character in Europe and America. It is discovered to be a mere trick to deceive the people. This being the fact, I am sorry that Doctor Morse should expose himself, by persisting to support such incoherent trumpery.

Instead of studying Robison and Barruel, it would be more becoming a Minister of the gospel to have recourse to the Bible, and discover the "signs of the times." In this book, the Doctor may be led to more evangelical contemplations; the *prophecies* and *revelations* might solemnize his mind to more judicious reflections than the extravagant reveries of these fanatics. Fleming, on the fulfilment of the Scriptures, is an author more adequate to the

purpoſes, as this divine has purſued the inquiry on ſcriptural principles. But, while Doctor Morſe adheres to ſuch rhodomontade as Robiſon and Barruel, and alarms the ignorant in his Faſt Sermons, with the ridiculous ſtories of knight-templars, &c. and excites the public attention with a number of outlandiſh names, as conſpirators againſt religion, he weakens his profeſſional energies, and rather appears in the ſtation of a bigot, than in the dignified deportment of a man of literature.

Religion does not require ſuch paltry aid; for HE, who has declared that the "gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it," will ſecure it from falling a prey to a few knight-templars, or a combination of illiterate Germans. The alarm ought to ſubſide in the Doctor's mind, for in this Commonwealth we have upwards of five hundred learned and reſpectable clergymen, (under the guidance of the SUPREME BEING,) in oppoſition to the combined efforts of ſuch antagoniſts. If we doubt of victory, we depreciate (what I am unwilling to allow) the *abilities of the clergy*. Why then is the Doctor deſcribing the people as running headlong to deſtruction? If the people in general do not reflect on the *clergy*, is it not ungenerous for any clergyman to reflect on the people? Wherein do the people appear ſo diſpoſed to injure the clergy? Are they not as *well paid*, as *well fed*, and in general as *highly eſtimated* as ever? While the clergy are treated well by the people, why ſhould any man ſuggeſt in his century ſermon, "that before the end of this century, the *majority of the people* of America will be ſo corrupt as to diſlike the reſtraints of religion?" If this ſhould be the unhappy ſtate of our country, I am afraid it will ariſe from the imprudent conduct of a few clerical zealots, who are *bewildering* their ſocieties with *politics*, inſtead of *enlightening* them with *religion*. Can it be ſuppoſed, at this enlightened age, that the vagaries of fanatics will paſs for goſpel truths? And if a clergyman will ſport the ſacred ſcriptures upon the frenzies of Robiſon and Barruel, he muſt expect to excite ridicule, inſtead of reſpect. Notwithſtanding theſe gloomy forebodings, I believe that real *unadulterated chriſtianity* will prevail in America, and thoſe of the clergy who walk in the path deſcribed by their MASTER, will be duly honoured and reverenced.

If *ſome* of the clergy have weakened their influence, on whoſe ſhoulders does the blame lie? If the Doctor conſiders himſelf as undervalued in public eſtimation, let him reflect on his own con-

duct ; he would never have been a ſubject of animadverſion, if he had kept within his clerical profeſſion, but when he overleaped the bounds of decency in denouncing men as Jacobins, Illuminati, &c. he might naturally ſuppoſe that ſuch cenſures would not be patiently borne, though ſanctified with the appellation of faſt ſermons, or pulpit diſcourſes. A clergyman *ſhould reſpect himſelf*, if he means to acquire it from others. A teacher of goſpel truths ſhould not preſume to denounce and anathematize as a political dictator ; or print ſermons with marginal notes, which afterwards prove falſe : If he will take this reſponſible part, he places himſelf on an equality with his fellow-citizens, and at once ſtrips himſelf of his eccleſiaſtical habiliments. If, inſtead of a clergyman, he aſſumes the politician, he muſt expect to take his lot in the ſcuffle.

As the Doctor has ſtyled his opponents "*unprincipled men*," he muſt excuſe the liberty taken in theſe remarks ; and though I would not retort in ſuch uncharitable language, yet when a man aſſumes too high a prerogative, a gentle reprimand may prove ſerviceable.——Health and fraternity, Doctor.

No. XXX.

ON PRESIDENT JEFFERSON'S SPEECH.

WHILE reading the ſpeech of Mr. Jefferſon, every American muſt feel an indignation that within the United States there are men ſo loſt to every honorary principle, as to calumniate a character ſo truly amiable and reſpectable. The contraſt between the exalted ſentiments of this patriot and ſtateſman, and the baſe detraction vented by his enemies, muſt ſtrike every conſiderate citizen with the moſt forcible conviction, that malignity and defamation are the leading paſſions of his opponents ; while *he* exhibits the benevolence, candour, and magnanimity of a Chriſtian, patriot, and philoſopher, his enemies have portrayed him in all the deteſtable qualities of infidelity, immorality, and atheiſm.

While his opponents have been aſſiduous to deſtroy his reputation, by the fouleſt epithets of detraction, *he* has riſen ſuperior to their calumny, and, inſtead of condeſcending to "return

railing for railing," has given ſtrong evidence of the magnanimity of an honeſt heart, and an exalted mind, over the deformities attached to a polluted temper and diſpoſition.

FELLOW-CITIZENS; while reading the ſpeech of Preſident Jefferſon, pauſe at every period, and recollect, that this is THE MAN who has been held up to public view as the object of univerſal deteſtation. While contemplating the ſublimity of the ſentiments; the eloquence of diction; the candour, and conciliating ſtrains, which adorn every paragraph, reflect, that *theſe are the words of a man* who has been denounced as the deſtroyer of government, the ſubverter of religion; the demoralizer, the deiſt, the atheiſt; and whoſe name has been profaned, as the LEADER of a banditti to overthrow government, and diſſolve the bands which unite and harmonize ſociety.

Ye miniſters of the goſpel; ye *individuals* who have anathematized him from the ſacred deſk, how muſt ſhame cover your faces, while peruſing this ſpecimen of his political, and religious integrity! He now ſtands unmaſked before the public, and with the purity of *his own ſignature*, announces himſelf an advocate for RELIGION: That religion, which places mankind on the baſis of equal rights; that undiſguiſed conduct which deſignates the *real chriſtian*, from the impoſing *hypocrite*: An enemy to the perſecuting ſpirit of bigotry, but a friend to that benign temper which ſecures the happineſs of ſociety, and eſtabliſhes the ſacred doctrines of the goſpel on a foundation too permanent to be ſhaken by zealots, or ſanguinary fanatics. He diſplays that mildneſs and moderation, which have too rarely been found in thoſe who have aſſumed the right of judging on his principles, and denouncing his conduct. While you have calumniated him, HE has ſcorned to retort in the language of reproach, but with that charity which is the ornament of chriſtianity, enforces with a mildneſs of perſuaſion, thoſe doctrines which you have charged him as violating; from henceforth then, be ſilent. Let your reproaches ceaſe; convince the world that you are "indeed, and in truth," what you profeſs to be; inſtead of reviling, acknowledge your miſconduct; give ſome ſpecimen of your benevolence, by your works; for as men of honour, and as chriſtians, you muſt feel a *conſciouſneſs* of your error; and thus convicted, you muſt confeſs, that the moſt permanent trait of

repentance, is a confeſſion of your manifold offences. This is a chriſtian regimen of honeſty and contrition.

Every claſs of citizens muſt feel a pride, when they peruſe a ſpeech fraught with ſuch claſſical erudition ; ſuch propriety of ſentiment ; ſuch unaffected evidences of patriotiſm and integrity. The character of an American aſſumes a dignified deportment in the literary and political world, when its Chief Magiſtrate diſplays a character ſo ſublime and majeſtic ; the great principles of our government are brought within the comprehenſion of every individual ; it is not a ſummary of our Conſtitution, but a PERFECT SYSTEM, ſo completely condenſed, that it exhibits in one view all the vital organs of its exiſtence. The man who ſtudies this ſpeech cannot be ignorant of the eſſential qualities of a free government ; it is a leſſon which ſhould be early learnt to our children, as containing thoſe rudiments, which ought to direct not only the ſtateſman in his duties, but inſtruct each citizen in the preſervation of his rights. Solon as a law-giver is immortalized, but Jefferſon as a commentator on the American Conſtitution, ſtands in a more permanent attitude. The doctrines which he inculcates, are familiar to republicans ; they have ever been the creed of thoſe, who have been falſely deſignated jacobins and diſorganizers.

The comprehenſiveneſs of his mind is conſpicuous in the minute details of thoſe eſſential principles of our government, which ought to direct its adminiſtration. They are compreſſed within ſuch preciſe limits, as to enforce them on the memory, and expreſſed with ſuch claſſical elegance, as to charm the ſcholar with their rhetorical brilliancy. This is the peculiar happineſs attached to Mr. Jefferſon's literary performances. His Notes on Virginia are ſtrewed with flowers ſelected from the parterre of the Belles Letters, while the DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE exhibits the ſublimity of his ſentiments, and will forever remain a monument of the immenſity of his talents.

It muſt be allowed, that the licentiouſneſs of the preſs has been extended in its utmoſt latitude in calumniating Mr. Jefferſon ; but far from touching this palladium of public liberty, he avows his ſacred attachment to its freedom. HE is not *afraid* to truſt his conduct to the inſpection of his fellow-citizens : neither is he deſirous to wreſt the PEN from the hands of freemen, and to rivet *ſhackels* in its place. Conſcious rectitude preſerves his confidence.

He readily ſubmits his actions to uncontroled inveſtigation. His own boſom is the tribunal, and integrity preſides as an impartial judge to confound his accuſers.

This being the real character of Mr. Jefferſon, how mortified and how abaſhed muſt his calumniators be, if they retain one ſpark of manly reflection! How muſt thoſe feel, who in *private caucuſſes* have vilified this exalted and virtuous citizen—who never *dare* openly to avow what they privately aſſerted—who have exerted themſelves in oppoſing the election of Mr. Jefferſon, contrary to the apparent voice of the people—who have ſhewn a rancour of temper (unbecoming even the character of a gentleman) through the whole progreſs of the late election---who have quitted the fair ground of argument, and ſcreened themſelves under the maſk of hypocriſy—who have endeavoured to injure Mr. Jefferſon, among the ſerious and well diſpoſed, when the conduct of many of them has been diſcordant to every principle of honour, religion and morality! Such is the ſyſtem purſued againſt every patriot who has attempted to counteract the plans of an inveterate faction. Such is the proceſs againſt Mr. Gerry and General Heath, and while this "JUNTO" can proſecute their wicked deſigns with any proſpect of ſucceſs, they will never "ceaſe from troubling," neither will this banditti "be at reſt." Let the magnanimity of the republicans be conſpicuous in the treatment of their enemies; but while we exerciſe our benevolence, let us guard againſt their inſidious and deceptive ſtratagems. Let us ſhew a ſuperiority over *their reign of terror*; but inſtead of truſting to their repentance, let us put it out of their power to renew their ſubtleties—remember, "the tyger crouches before he leaps."

No. XXXI.

THE MEANS TO LESSEN TAXES.

THE people of America are peculiarly attached to *Liberty* and *Property*. Perſecuted in England by the arm of tyranny, they ſought an aſylum in this country for the enjoyment of their political and religious principles. After experiencing the ſanguinary diſpoſition of the government of Britain, they became tenacious

of thoſe rights which they had acquired by their emigration. With a laudable jealouſy they watched over the conduct of their magiſtrates, and in every inſtance were alive to all thoſe tender emotions which naturally ariſe in the minds of men, who had fled from perſecution.

The cold, unfeeling temper of thoſe who were in league with the Britiſh during our revolutionary conflict: the apathy of thoſe individuals who were within the lines of the enemy,—can ſpeak with a peculiar indifference on the fears and apprehenſions of the people. They can expreſs their ſurpriſe, that the citizens are alarmed, or that they ſhould diſtruſt the intentions of thoſe who are appointed to adminiſter the government; but from the firſt ſettlement of the country, it has been our misfortune to experience the worſt of evils, from the hands of men, *who made the higheſt profeſſions of friendſhip.* Who would have thought that Hutchinſon was planning the ruin of America, under that courtly maſk of cordiality which ſo peculiarly diſtinguiſhed his character? He was the idol of the *Clergy*, as *hypocriſy* was the coat of mail under which he attempted to render himſelf invulnerable.

Far be it from me, to cenſure any *pre-eminent* character of our late adminiſtration; but if we examine the meaſures adopted for a few years paſt, it cannot but excite ſuſpicions which are hard to be ſuppreſſed. Who are the authors of our troubles I will not pretend to ſay, but that we are in *difficulties* is too evident to be diſputed. That there has been a party, deviſing "*ways and means*" to bring us into a war with France and an alliance with England is declared by Ariſtides. The conduct of individuals, in *too many inſtances*, has given a ſanction to ſuch a declaration. Every *aggravation* has attended their repreſentations, as they related to *France*, and every *palliative* as connected with *England*; while we have torn ourſelves aſunder from France by a *Non-Intercourſe*, we have as anxiouſly renewed our connexion with Britain; while we have reſented, with all the rage of malignity, the violations of our commercial rights by the *French*, we have *paſſively* ſurrendered our neutral privileges to the arbitrary deciſions of the *Engliſh*.

If this country had only experienced the effects of *wrong judgment*, and the miſchiefs could be as eaſily rectified as the ſentiments could be retracted; we might overlook the injudiciouſneſs of thoſe

who have been the authors of our difficulties ; but a HEAVY DEBT is contracted, and the preſent and future generations muſt become "*tributary*" to diſcharge it. If we could *diſcharge our debt* as eaſily as we could *diſband our army*, the evil would be remedied without any eſſential inconvenience. While reflecting on this ſubject, remember, fellow-citizens, *we are to pay for our folly ;* every dollar expended muſt come from the pockets of *The People.*

During the debates in the convention on the adoption of the federal conſtitution, the duties ariſing from impoſt were thought adequate to all the eſſential purpoſes of our government, alſo for the payment of our foreign and domeſtic debt. The people were led to anticipate a cheap and energetic adminiſtration under the operation of this new ſyſtem ; but, ſtrange to relate, within about twelve years, *in a ſtate of peace*, the moſt powerful reſources of revenue are called into action ; *Impoſt, Exciſe, Stamp Duties, Land and Houſe Tax*, and to cap the climax, *a Loan at the enormous premium of eight per cent.*

Such has been the effect of the late adminiſtration ; and can any man ſay that *proſperity* has attended this country, when ſuch an immenſity of taxes have ariſen under its operation ? Who is to blame, is not *at preſent* my inquiry ; ſome future numbers may be more explicit on this ſubject ; but I can with confidence aſk, whether any man had reaſon to ſuppoſe, that within ſo few years, the debts of the country would have called for ſuch financial exertions ? Every baſe ſyſtem of ſpeculation has been proſecuted ; the artful deſigning knave has preyed on the diſtreſſes of the unfortunate ; and a few men have been able to acquire a profuſeneſs of fortune, while the induſtrious part of the community are burdened with exceſſive duties to furniſh their quarterly intereſt.

It is evident, that the ECONOMY recommended by Mr. Jefferſon was not fully practiſed during the late adminiſtration ; for if it had, the neceſſities of this country could not have demanded ſuch exceſſive expenditures. The treaſury department has been obſcured in myſtery ; it is ſo inexplicable, that one man will aſſert, we have *leſſened* the public debt, while another will as confidently maintain that it has *increaſed* millions ; whether it has *increaſed* or *leſſened* is an important conſideration. It might reaſonably be expected that the debt would have been nearly extinguiſhed by the reſpective ſources of revenue. The people have been paying, for a number

of years back, every ſpecies of taxes, and yet they remain uncertain, whether we are not *more in debt* than before they made their payments. The extravagance in the expenditures of public money is generally allowed to exceed even European countries; our trifling *navy*, it is ſuppoſed, has coſt the United States four times as much as the ſame force in any other nation; the *army* was a wanton laviſhment of public money, and a moſt egregious impoſition on the United States. Millions have thus been ſported with in various channels; Algerine tribute, grants for carrying into effect a Britiſh treaty, expenſes of foreign miniſters, and, above all, that *mauſoleum* of folly and extravagance the Federal City. While our money is thus profuſely ſquandered away, can we expect to diſcharge our debts, even though our taxes ſhould increaſe fourfold? Through the agency of perſonal patronage, the benefits of this extravagance have been confined within about one hundred families within the United States.

The ſtate of the TREASURY is of the higheſt importance; an inveſtigation of the financiering ſyſtem, receipts and expenditures and the reſpective items which have exhauſted the ſupplies as rapidly as they were furniſhed. Theſe are particulars which call for the critical eye of the new adminiſtration, and if the documents are not *burnt*, it is hoped that a juſt ſtatement will be made; that the people ſhould be informed how their money is ſpent, and what is the remaining balance of their debts. A few men have enjoyed the advantages of theſe extravagances, but the burdens on commerce, agriculture, and manufactures preſs hard on the induſtrious part of the community, and begin to excite diſagreeable ſenſations. Some other ſources of revenue muſt be adopted, for it is unreaſoneble that the whole weight of an extravagant ſyſtem of expenditure (which has principally enriched a particular claſs of men) ſhould be laid on the *mercantile*, *agricultural*, and *manufacturing* branches. Let thoſe who have experienced the "*bleſſings of the public debt*," bear their proportion of the burden; common ſenſe requires an equalization of taxes; the induſtry of a country ought not to be the ſole object of taxation; affluence and indolence have as broad ſhoulders to ſuſtain the ponderancy.

On the eſtabliſhment of peace, how are our YOUNG MEN to acquire a mercantile ſubſiſtence, if commerce is cramped with exceſſive duties? How are the manufacturing and agricultural

branches to be ſupported, if every tradeſman and farmer are borne down by exorbitant taxes? But whatever may be the diſtreſſes ariſing from future taxation, Mr. Jefferſon cannot be anſwerable for them, as the debts for which he is to make appropriation were contracted during a former adminiſtration. His *economy* would have prevented them; but the errors of thoſe who formerly had the lead in the financial departments, have brought a debt upon us, which will require the moſt accurate arrangement juſtly to liquidate.

The money departments are the great eſſential points, to which the preſent adminiſtration muſt be directed; an able and *induſtrious* financier is the great requiſite of our government. When the people *underſtand* their public accounts, and when *economy* is practiſed in expending the money, and *each claſs of citizens bear their proportion*, a general confidence will pervade the community; but diſtruſt will ever ſubſiſt, while money concerns are involved in clouds and darkneſs. The Americans are ever ready to ſupport government, but they are equally deſirous to know how their money goes.

Under Mr. Jefferſon's adminiſtration, we expect an open, explicit ſtatement of all pecuniary tranſactions; and there is the higheſt expectation, that ſuch a man will be found, who will furniſh not only the amount of debt, but recommend ſuch "*ways and means*," as to put it in the power of the people, *honourably* and *equitably* to diſcharge it. We wiſh to pay our debts, but the ſupport of *naval agents*, with a long train of *hangers-on*, in various departments, are burdens which were never contemplated by the people, on the adoption of the federal conſtitution. The conſtitution was made for the people, and not the people for the conſtitution; or, in other words, it ought to be adminiſtered in ſuch a manner, as that the people ſhould not be oppreſſed under it.

No. XXXII.

A PUBLICK DEBT, A PUBLICK EVIL.

THE proſperity of a country, and the proſperity of an individual muſt be calculated on the ſame principles; the ſame ſtandard

which determines the accuracy of one, equally decides the validity of the other. Mankind are too apt to confound their ideas in judging on particular ſubjects; more eſpecially when ſpeaking of *government*, they ſoar into the regions of myſtery, and inconſiderately adopt the falſe doctrines of deſigning politicians, that it is a ſcience too intricate and perplexed for common apprehenſion—the more abſtruſe and unintelligible the adminiſtration, the more "ſtupendous the ſyſtem" of wiſdom which guides and directs thoſe who govern.

But this is falſe reaſoning; upon this ground, the abſurd doctrine, that "a public debt is a public bleſſing," is founded. It is impoſſible, that ſuch a groſs ſentiment ſhould be inculcated, if the people would exerciſe the ſame common ſenſe on this queſtion, as they do in the general concerns of life. A public debt muſt, in its conſequences, create public taxes; taxes muſt be collected from the people, and thoſe who pay them muſt inevitably feel their ultimate tendency and pernicious effects.

What can be the difference between a nation and an individual? Do not the ſame concluſions follow in one caſe as in the other? If a private citizen is diſtreſſed by his debts, if he is expoſed to many difficulties from the multiplicity of demands upon him, why ſhould we ſuppoſe that a nation may not equally experience the operation of ſuch embarraſſments?

This appears plain reaſoning;—but unfortunately for nations, an oppoſite doctrine is inculcated; and even in America, an attempt has been made to inſtil this abſurdity, as the teſt of political orthodoxy. It has been ſo far conſidered as the pivot of *federaliſm*, that the man who preſumed to ſpeak of the public debt, or recommended economy, has been ſtigmatized a jacobin, and expoſed to every reflection which could injure his political reputation. In ſhort, extravagance in public expenditures appears to have been ſyſtematically contemplated as the mark of national happineſs and proſperity; and though this chimerical mode has been ſecretly adopted by individuals, yet the project was too abſurd to be openly divulged; for while the plan was intended to increaſe the public debt, the citizens have been flattered that it was annually decreaſing. But that the public debt has increaſed, cannot be controverted; for if this had not been the fact, how is it

poſſible that the augmentation of taxes ſhould ſo rapidly have taken place? It either proves that we have expended our reſources needleſsly, or that the debt had kept pace with the call for taxes. The reaſoning to be drawn from the increaſe of taxes is, that the demands on the government are equal to the demands on the people; and this being granted, it follows that the *original debt* was within the revenue ariſing from *impoſt*, but that the augmentation requires an exciſe, ſtamp-duties, land-tax, and an eight per cent. loan, to cancel the arrearages.

We may talk about the *decreaſe* of the public debt as long as we pleaſe; financiering legerdemain may perplex the ſtatements from the treaſury department; Mr. Harper may write to his conſtituents that our pecuniary affairs are in a proſperous ſituation; but when the people find, that all the reſources of the country are brought into operation, and that our public credit demanded eight per cent. to ſupport it, they cannot be ſo loſt to the eſtimation of pounds, ſhillings and pence, as to deceive themſelves by fictitious calculations. The money, raiſed from various ſources, ought to have diminiſhed the debt by this time; and it is but a poor conſolation to be told by a few ſpeculators, that we are *not more in arrears* than when we only paid the trifling duties of impoſt.

It would be highly ſatisfactory to the people of the United States, to have laid before them the whole revenue, ariſing from the reſpective taxes and loans, from the firſt year after the revenue ſyſtem was eſtabliſhed, to the 3d of March, 1801. Should this be done, I believe the people would be aſtoniſhed at the magnitude of the amount. From this ſtatement, the citizens would be able to judge what have been their exertions in ſupport of the government, and from this document they could aſcertain how far the revenue might have been applied to diſcharge the public debt. This ſtatement would at once open the eyes of the people; and when they looked at the amount, the object would ſtrike them with wonder and ſurpriſe. But the misfortune is, the treaſury accounts have hitherto been involved in myſtery; there has been ſuch a perplexity attending theſe communications, that but few men knew, after they had peruſed them, the real ſtate of the buſineſs. In ſhort, it has been ſo intricate, that in one circle, we ſhould hear them boaſting of the decreaſe of our national debt, and in another deploring its augmentation.

But if the whole revenue was explicitly declared, and the expenditures were as clearly ſtated, the people at large could as accurately judge, *what they had paid and what had become of the money*, as the ableſt financier and the moſt plodding negociator on the continent. This would be bringing our financial projects to a clear, defined point, and the reſources of the country would give an evidence to the world, of the *immenſe abilities* of the United States in the ſupport of government.

Mr. Jefferſon being introduced to the chair of government, by the *republican* citizens of the United States, in vindication of his adminiſtration, it is hoped that ſuch a ſtatement will be made. The people will then ſee, what has hitherto been done, and if their taxes continue, that it is in conſequence of previous engagements. If a debt is contracted by a former adminiſtration, it is not Mr. Jefferſon's fault; but the fulfilment of former contracts is indiſpenſable on his part. Thoſe, then, who ſneeringly obſerve, that the republicans expect no taxes under Mr. Jefferſon's adminiſtration, are to remember that the debt was contracted in the days of his predeceſſor.

The citizens of America are peculiarly fond of knowing how their money goes; they are ready to pay their taxes, but at the ſame time are anxious to pry into the appropriation of them. Like honeſt men, they are deſirous to anſwer all *neceſſary and legal demands*, but it is a *New-England faſhion* to examine accounts with a critical acuteneſs. Millions of dollars are large ſums, and when they come from the pockets of the people, they feel a ſatisfaction in knowing their direction. If they are fairly expended, they are not diſpoſed to murmur, but if they go under the idea that "a public debt is a public bleſſing," it is apt to make them jealous of the propriety of the principle. They love their country, and they love their money; they are not fond of pageantry, and not willing to pay taxes, juſt to gratify the pride of men, who vainly imagine that the people *honour themſelves* by paying for their extravagances.

The ECONOMY recommended by Preſident Jefferſon is the keyſtone of republicaniſm; this is the conſummation devoutly to be wiſhed by the republican citizens of the United States. If this principle had been ſtrictly adhered to, I am perſuaded the revenue already raiſed would have nearly extinguiſhed the publi

debt. But the poiſon which has been infuſed into our government, has given a baneful tendency to corrupt the vital organs of the adminiſtration; it has raiſed a few to eminence, and thrown a heavy debt on the bulk of the citizens. A falſe, deceptive appearance of proſperity has bewildered the public mind; but when peace takes place, and the immenſe demands from the banks, cuſtom-houſes, &c. are cancelled, theſe films which now obſcure the ſight will drop from our eyes, and we ſhall not only *ſee*, but *feel* the effects of our political credulity and folly.

No. XXXIII.

ON THE ABUSE OF FEDERALISM.

IT is worthy of remark, to obſerve the peculiar efficacy of the term "*federaliſm*," as connected with the ſtratagems and deſigns of a particular deſcription of men. It has for many years paſt been uſed as a *charm*, to ſubſtantiate the propriety of character, both as it reſpects religion and politics. It has alſo had its operation in the *faſhionable circles*, being conſidered as a general paſſport of *good-breeding*, and a ſubſtantial badge of virtue and politeneſs. Under this deluſive impreſſion, the YOUNG MEN conſidered an avowal of theſe principles as the moſt convenient introduction to the company of the *bon ton*, and inconſiderately adopted thoſe political ſentiments which have a tendency to promote the intereſt of *Britiſh factors*, to their injury; for it is a fact, that the leading men, who are now in favour of thoſe meaſures which have been pre-eminently ſtyled *federaliſm*, are the identical perſons who were the moſt boiſterous ſome years ago to deſtroy the very ſyſtem they are now pretending to ſupport. If this obſervation is denied, a full proof will be given, and the names of the individuals mentioned. The young Americans have been egregiouſly impoſed on, in this political controverſy, and ſome future numbers will be appropriated to undeceive them.

This falſe deſcription of *federaliſm* was the teſt even of *eccleſiaſtical* orthodoxy. However pious, exemplary, and attentive to the duties of his profeſſion, the clerical character has too often been tried by the *federal touchſtone*. However devout in the diſ-

charge of his functions; however kind and charitable in his conduct, yet *federalism* was "the pearl of great price," without which, no man could expect the affection of his parishioners, or the esteem of his fellow-citizens. If the clergyman could obtain the *role d'equipage* of *federalism*, he might pass current as a saint of the first magnitude, even though the general tenour of his behaviour was not strictly conformable to that modest deportment, which designates the disciple of his heavenly Master. If he neglected the duties of his profession; imposed on the credulity of his parishioners; published sermons containing the grossest falsehoods; or endeavoured to palm on the public the most chimerical absurdities, yet *federalism* shrouded him from those censures which justice, and even Christianity demanded.

How many worthy characters have been calumniated, whose life and conversation were conformable to every moral principle! whose behaviour, in the various departments of life, has in no instance been impeached with any *specific criminality!* How often have we seen abuse and detraction heaped on them, as the most abandoned in society, because they exercised the right of freemen, or presumed to differ from those, who monopolized the appellation of *federalists!* This intolerance has pervaded almost every circle in the community, and the reputation of men has been repeatedly sacrificed, at the shrine of party, with the most wanton barbarity. I would not be thought unjustly censorious, but the validity of these remarks is submitted to the candid decision of an enlightened public.

However honest the dealings of the merchant; however punctual in the discharge of his engagements; however industrious the tradesman in his occupation, yet his *good name* was no longer secure from defamation than he became the sycophantic approver of particular men and measures, or *dared* to think for himself in any matters in which the honour or prosperity of his country was involved. Like the Jews of old, the cry was, "*away with him, away with him*—he is not Cæsar's friend."

This infatuation of the term *federalism* was so powerful, that it nearly established an order of nobility among us. Under this title, the dishonest have oftentimes risen superior to the man of integrity; a certain *hauteur* prevailed in the deportment of some who were dignified with this appellation. Many, whose credit

would ſcarcely paſs the ordeal of an hour, would aſſume a right to incur a debt of thouſands, and if *requeſted* to diſcharge it, would think their plea of *federaliſm* was as prompt payment, as a check on the bank. Some even conſidered it as an *honour to a jacobin*, to have their name on his books, and the delay of payment was often conceived as an indulgence to prolong his reſpectability. Like a Scotch *laird*, they thought it a great *condeſcenſion* to be a *debtor* to the canaille, or vulgar.

In the faſhionable circles, *federaliſm* was the Alpha and Omega, it was the viſiting card to the ſelf-created nobles and nobleſſe; it was the wardrobe from whence the habiliments of elegance and taſte were ſelected; it was the garment, which adorned the modern Cheſterfields, and without which a man was oftentimes expoſed to be bound hand and foot, and turned into outer darkneſs.

Thus the abuſe of terms has been rendered ſubſervient to party purpoſes. The times have been ſuch, that a man required a ſtrength of *nerves* as well as a ſtrength of *principles*. The attack of federaliſm has been ſo violent and outrageous, that every faculty of the human mind has been aſſailed to enforce its eſtabliſhment —calumny and ridicule, perſonal aſſault and private detraction, have alternately been uſed to intimidate and confound thoſe who exerciſed, not only the right of judgment, but the right of conſcience. A ſyſtem of terror of the moſt malicious and vindictive nature has been proſecuted, and the freedom of citizens has nearly been denied to every one, who did not bow their knee at this altar of impoſition.

The term *federaliſm* has been groſsly violated; it has been made a ſtepping-ſtone to promote an intereſt, oppoſed in moſt inſtances to the fundamental principles of the federal conſtitution. —Federaliſm has been abuſed in its real, appropriate ſignification; it has, as it relates to many, been nothing more than toryiſm in maſquerade. Under this deceptive maſk, every enemy of our revolution has rallied; there is not one old tory but what has ſtyled himſelf a federaliſt; in all our political controverſies, the tories have aſſumed this infallibility of denomination. If an alien-act was paſſed, the tories approved the meaſure—if the liberty of the preſs was violated, the tories were vociferous for its moſt rigid operation—if a citizen was confined in goal, or ſubjected to heavy fines, under the rigour of the Common Law of England, the tories

applauded the infliction—if a ſtanding army was raiſed, the tories recommended its continuance—if the people were burdened with taxes, the tories hailed the augmentation as the wiſeſt adminiſtration of government—if Mr. Jefferſon, Mr. Madiſon, Mr. Gallatin, Mr. Lincoln, Gen. Dearborne, or even the venerable Samuel Adams, were calumniated, the tories were aſſiduous in aggravating the ſcurrility—if an attempt was made to involve us in a war with France, and an alliance with England, the tories were the moſt active to propagate every vain ſtory to urge on the deſtructive ſyſtem—if the Preſident ſent commiſſioners to France to renew our friendſhip, the tories reprobated his conduct in terms the moſt degrading :—in ſhort, federaliſm was the watch-word, which operated as the charm to deſtroy all the vital republican principles of our conſtitution, and to bring the United States to the brink of diſunion. The abuſe of federaliſm, therefore, has bewildered the people. The enemies of our country have taken to themſelves an appellation, which really and eſſentially belongs to thoſe whom they have ſtyled jacobins. The controverſy is not confined to words, but to principles ; the republicans, (falſely ſtyled jacobins) have always been the ſubſtantial ſupporters of the Federal Conſtitution ; they have been anxiouſly diſpoſed to have it adminiſtered upon thoſe principles which firſt gave it exiſtence ; they are oppoſed to every meaſure which leads to extravagance, and which gives a power into the hands of the *few* to depreſs the *many*.

The ſpeech of Preſident Jefferſon, as it relates to the adminiſtration of government, is the political creed of the republicans ; the rights of the citizens, both in their political and religious capacity are expreſſed in language conſonant to the feelings and ſentiments of a free people.

While thus deſcribing the pernicious tendency of the term federaliſm, as operating for many years paſt, I would not be thought to explode the propriety of its adoption. Federaliſm is a prominent article in the American compact ; it is not a deceptive quality to anſwer party purpoſes, but a defined principle, which muſt ever invigorate the whole ſyſtem of our government. The conſtitution lives and moves by its vitality—it is the locks of the American Sampſon ; but while we contemplate its efficacy, let us not be led away by the hollow ſound iſſuing through the caverns from whence, during our revolution, the hoarſe murmurs

of our enemies proceeded. Theſe falſe-termed federaliſts are ſapping the ground on which our happineſs is placed; they are attempting to render the reſpective ſtates jealous of each other; they are trying their ſkill at dividing the Southern from the Northern States. The "NEW-ENGLAND PALLADIUM" is brought into view, as if to rally the parties under territorial diſtinctions. Publications have often diſgraced thoſe papers which aſſumed the federal title, to urge a diviſion, and the election of the Preſident has been denounced as the overbearing preponderancy of ſouthern ſlaves. All theſe appearances forbode ſome deep project to ſhake the foundation of the federal conſtitution; they appear ſyſtematically purſued, and the opprobrious epithets on our Executive, which are daily publiſhed, we have reaſon to fear are precurſors to the fatal cataſtrophe.

"*We are all federaliſts,*" ſays the Preſident; that is, *every real friend to America* is in reality a friend to the harmony and union of the reſpective ſtates. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, rally round our conſtitution, and maintain its *federal features*—let us ſcan the deſigns of men, who, with ſpecious pretences, have courted the ſmiles of *federaliſm*, but who wiſh to violate the chaſtity of our patroneſs in their unhallowed embraces. The *real republicans* are the protectors of her honour, and under the wiſe and benign management of our conſtituted authorities, the enemies of our future proſperity, we truſt in God, will be baffled.

The foregoing obſervations are not made to excite any unreaſonable jealouſies, or to create a ſpirit of party animoſity; but in order to prevent the *continuance* of *diſunion* in our public affairs, it is neceſſary to know the *ſource of diviſion*. This falſe appropriation of federaliſm is the CAUSE of all our difficulties, and the Eſſex junto have taken an undue advantage by ſtyling themſelves "excluſive federaliſts"; a wound which had ſo long been feſtering, ought to be probed to the bottom, and when we underſtand the *cauſe* of complaint, we can eaſily apply the remedy.

No. XXXIV.

ECONOMY.

SPECULATIVE ſubjects are liable to endleſs controverſy. But there are axioms, both in politics and religion, to which the mind admits of no diſſent—the moſt prominent of which are, the adoration of the SUPREME BEING, an adherence to our Conſtitutions, and a patriotic attachment to the freedom, ſovereignty and independence of our country. Theſe are tenets which baffle all oppoſition, and are the unequivocal teſts of religious, moral, and ſocial rectitude.

In politics a variety of opinions may be promulgated and enforced; honeſt men may differ as to the particular mode of adminiſtering the government, but there is one *radical principle*, which all the ſophiſtry of ſtateſmen can never eradicate. The principle which I allude to, is ECONOMY. It is the blood of the body politic—it is the ſtamina which invigorates the ſocial organs, and gives animation to all the movements by which they are directed. It is the alpha and omega of a republican government, and the warrantee which ſecures the welfare and happineſs of a people.

ECONOMY in government, is like *charity* in religion. It is the cardinal virtue, and while we enumerate all the pleaſing characteriſtics of a proſperous adminiſtration, we muſt finally conclude, that *the greateſt of theſe is* ECONOMY.

The "*modern philoſophy*," that "a public debt is a public bleſſing," is equally as abſurd, as if a man ſhould ſay, that "private vices are public benefits; and a magiſtrate ſhould be as reprehenſible in endeavoring to augment the national debt, in order to increaſe the happineſs of the country, as a miniſter of the goſpel to diſſeminate vice to promote the cauſe of chriſtianity.

Extravagance in public expenditures is the "*tare among the wheat*," and a farmer may as well expect to reap a plentiful harveſt with his ſoil overrun with noxious weeds, as a government to hope for proſperity, from a profuſe laviſhment of its pecuniary reſources. The ſame ſimple principles are as applicable to *nations* as to *individuals*: and though a contrary doctrine has been ad-

vanced in England and America by "*modern Philoſophers*," yet "*common ſenſe*" revolts at the folly and tendency of the ſentiment.

From the above plain poſitions, I am authoriſed to draw theſe concluſions, viz. that the *finances* of this country, at this early period, ought not to extend to the *utmoſt abilities* of the people, but ſhould be kept within thoſe rational bounds, which, *in a time of peace*, are adequate to an *economical adminiſtration* of the government; and the accounts ſhould be ſo clearly ſtated to the citizens, as that they might know to what purpoſe their money has been appropriated. If we had purſued this method, is it probable that the ultimate reſources of this country would have been brought into operation, ſo ſoon after the adoption of the federal conſtitution? Within about twelve years, we have nearly embraced the extenſive ſyſtem of Britiſh taxation—our impoſt and exciſe are proportionably burdenſome with thoſe of the Engliſh—ſtamp duties, houſe and land taxes, already bear heavy on the yeomanry; but our loans at *eight per cent.* exceed the laviſh douceurs of Britain, even under all the weight of war and perplexity of their finances. In order then to know the amount of expenſes, it is proper that the treaſury department ſhould be fully inveſtigated, and that the ſtatement ſhould be within the comprehenſion of every intelligent citizen; when this is done, all the financiering myſtery will be diſſipated, which has for many years paſt clouded our fiſcal communications—arithmetic, inſtead of "*inſtrumentality*," would be the table whereby we could make our calculation—debt and credit would be ſubſtantiated beyond the poſſibility of deception, and the *balance* would be ſo explicit, that we ſhould not be puzzled to know whether it was in our favour or againſt us.

This ſyſtem of expenditure is ſo important, that we cannot dwell too long on the ſubject. The people of the United States are generally induſtrious and enterpriſing; the property earned by the farmer in his field, by the tradeſman in his work-ſhop, and by the merchant in his compting-room, is too ſacred to be ſported with, for the emolument of others. The *ſweat of the brow* are drops too precious to be applied in ſuch profuſion, as to run down (like the oil from Aaron's beard) on the ſkirts of a few favourites, but, like a valuable and coſtly ingredient, ſhould be applied with a medical ſkill and accuracy. That this country is involved in a heavy debt, cannot be denied, and that the articles of taxation

have far exceeded every calculation which could rationally be made, is equally as evident. Though the inveſtigation of the treaſury department may bring to view ſuch particulars as may be diſguſting to ſome individuals, yet the body of citizens would be highly gratified by the diſcloſure.

The duties of impoſt, exciſe, &c. have been more generally paid within the United States than in any other country—it is true, a *few federaliſts* have been caught attempting to defraud the government. In England, ſmuggling is reduced to a ſcience, and a great proportion of dutied articles are landed clear of the inſpection of the cuſtom-houſe; notwithſtanding which, they are able to pay an intereſt on a debt of four hundred and fifty-two millions ſterling.

This being a fact, it muſt be granted, that an immenſe revenue has ariſen from duties ſince the adoption of the Federal Conſtitution. The queſtion then is, WHAT HAS BECOME OF THE MONEY? This is a very important inquiry, as it involves in it the ſecret tranſactions within the Treaſury; it brings into view the expenditures of an Army and Navy, Indian War, with all the items of "miſmanagement and neglect," Algerine Negociations, Treaty Appropriations, Agent Contracts, Bank and Foreign Loans, &c. in ſhort, the ſanctum ſanctorum of fiſcal arrangements would be laid open to the inſpection of an intereſted public: and, like a doom's-day book, would decide on the merits or demerits of thoſe who have had the management of our government. In this inquiry, it is probable we ſhould diſcover the *magic ſource of* FEDERALISM—how far the private intereſt of individuals has been connected with certain high-toned meaſures; the bleſſings of agencies, contracts, and official appointments, both at home and abroad. We might poſſibly diſcover the *cauſe* of the violent oppoſition to a change of men and meaſures—why Mr. Jefferſon has been calumniated, and why Mr. Gallatin is dreaded. The Treaſury department is ſo involved in the meaſures of government, that it is the key by which we may hope to unlock the *Pandora box*, which contains *tub-plots*, *Ocean maſſacres*, and even Harper's famous "*clues to conſpiracies.*" That is, we may know how far theſe alarms have been connected with certain financiering projects.

That every dollar has not been fairly expended, I would not preſume to ſuggeſt, but information on this ſubject is neceſſary and

proper. It would ſerve to quiet the minds of thoſe who are jealous, that we have not "worked things right;" but if the expenditures can be juſtly accounted for, it will ſtop the clamours of ſuch as are cenſorious in their remarks.

The great oppoſition made in our *federal* papers againſt the appointment of Mr. Gallatin, as ſecretary of the treaſury, has a tendency to excite a ſuſpicion, that this inveſtigation would expoſe particular tranſactions to ſevere animadverſion. Theſe ſame perſons are firm friends to Mr. Hamilton, though he is as much a *foreigner* as Mr. Gallatin. They pretend to object to his appointment on this ground, but his abilities and peculiar talents for this buſineſs, even his enemies cannot controvert. The finances of this country have long been his ſtudy, and the accuracy of his ſtatements cannot be denied by his opponents. His induſtry and integrity were never brought into queſtion, and his family connections and large landed property are pledges of his faithful adherence to the happineſs and proſperity of the United States. He has been calumniated by thoſe who have committed the ſame violation on others, but, thank heaven, calumny in the federal papers is not the evidence of a man's demerit; it rather qualifies him for the confidence of every real friend to America. Though calumny has exhauſted her venom againſt his political conduct, yet his honeſty has ſtood invulnerable againſt all the ſhafts of his opponents. If talents are requiſite, he poſſeſſes them to as great a degree as any man—if *morality* is the touchſtone, will Mr. Gallatin be *injured* in his reputation by a compariſon with others? I will venture to predict, that the firſt communication to Congreſs from Mr. Gallatin, on the ſtate of the treaſury, will be as univerſally applauded, as the ſpeech of Preſident Jefferſon. Such light will be thrown on the dark receſſes of the treaſury, that each citizen will conſider the ſtatement among the moſt valuable papers of the government.

I have been more particular in my remarks, as our money concerns are peculiarly intereſting. In caſe of peace, it will be difficult to ſupport the ſyſtem of revenue under all the embarraſſments of commerce. The preſent ſtate of the treaſury is due to the adminiſtration of Mr. Jefferſon; it is the ground-work of his future conduct, as the people ought to know the ſituation of our money concerns at the time of his entrance into office. If the laſt adminiſtration left a heavy debt upon us—if an immenſe revenue

has been raiſed, and it has all been expended, certainly Mr. Jefferſon is not anſwerable for the conſequences. He, no doubt, will purſue a ſyſtem of economy, but the debt hitherto contracted, is a burden which he muſt be obliged to diſcharge. His enemies are aware of his embarraſſments, and are telling the people that the change is of no conſequence, as taxes will be equally as high under the preſent as the laſt adminiſtration. In order, therefore, to prevent an unreaſonable cenſure, if a juſt ſtatement is made of our fiſcal concerns, the complaint of taxes muſt reſt on thoſe who originated the evil. His public conduct will ſtand on his individual merit, and what may be attached to it in conſequence of previous embarraſſments cannot be chargeable to him.

I again repeat, that the treaſury department is of all others the moſt intereſting and important. It is the ark of our political ſafety, and may the economical ſyſtem of Mr. Jefferſon convince the people, that the waters of extravagance have ſubſided.

No. XXXV.

INTRODUCTORY TO SOME FUTURE COGENT REFLECTIONS.

IN politics as in religion the human mind is more influenced by paſſion than reaſon. To effect this purpoſe, in all controverſial points relating to church or ſtate, certain *technical terms* are uſed by partizans to gain an aſcendancy. The *divine* conſounds his antagoniſt with the preponderating charm of *orthodoxy*; if he acquires a popular applauſe under this faſcinating appellation, he is ſure to gain an aſcendancy over every opponent; for who can ſtand in oppoſition to orthodoxy? But the misfortune is, that the world is not agreed in applying the term to any particular ſect. In ſome countries, the infallibility of the Pope, the purity of Mother Church, tranſubſtantiation, and the efficacy of prieſtly benedictions, are the teſt of *orthodoxy*. In the *reformed* countries, the Right Reverend Father in God partakes in ſome degree of the excellencies and virtues of the Papal Hierarchy, and the various

grades iſſuing from this evangelical ſount are eſtimated in proportion as the benediction is accompanied with official emoluments.

"*A Saint in crape is twice a Saint in lawn.*"

A firm belief in all the paraphernalia of this *reformed* eſtabliſhment, is in ſome nations called *orthodoxy;* and no man can expect promotion or even common credence, if he is ſo jacobinical as not to ſubſcribe to every article promulgated by St. Athanaſius. Orthodoxy is a term which has had a wonderful effect in ſociety—the Calviniſt claims it as his prerogative—the Socinian aſſumes a right to the appellation—the Univerſaliſt modeſtly begs to be conſidered within the latitude of its influence; and every ſect, however differing in the moſt eſſential points, plume themſelves as carrying this ſtandard.

Thus, in religion, we are led away by a term which in itſelf is perfectly right, provided we can aſcertain the real principle which conſtitutes its authenticity. The definition of Orthodoxy, is *true belief;* but the ſentiment is ſo ſublimated, that we are loſt in the application. One man's true belief is another's evident error; various ſpeculative ſubjects lead to different concluſions, but paſſion often ſo "*demoralizes*" reaſon, that men may ſo far adhere to terms imbibed by education, as to anathematize others becauſe they aſſume a right to exerciſe their judgment in deciding for themſelves.

Theſe remarks are not made to weaken the ground of orthodoxy as it reſpects religion; but to ſhew, that *terms*, without a defined object, are more apt to irritate partizans than to make converts. High church and low church, illuminati, jacobiniſm, anti-federaliſm, *modern philoſophy*, *demoralizing principles*, &c. have been the common cant phraſeology of very formidable opponents for many years, and it was only to give currency to the reſpective appellations as the parties acquired an aſcendancy, in order to blaſt the reputation of the individuals who eſpouſed oppoſite opinions. Reaſon was buried in the maſs of detraction, and no man's character ſtood ſecure while there were more tongues to *bellow* it down, than to *reaſon* it up. In this caſe it is like a conteſt on a precipice, the moſt numerous could eaſily *croud over* their opponents.

At preſent I ſhall be very brief in making my application.—The diſpoſition, above deſcribed, has too long been the *palladium* erected againſt every thing that looked like an oppoſition to certain eſtabliſhed terms in politics. At the period when our Conſtitution was under the deliberative inveſtigation of the ſtate convention, the terms *federal* and *anti-federal* were the principal weapons of warfare. The man who heſitated to adopt it without amendments was cried down as an anti-federaliſt; federaliſm was the order of the day, and the teſt of patriotiſm was an explicit avowal of your belief in every minute point of the inſtrument ſubmitted to the conſideration of the people; the perſon who dared to think, was purſued as an enemy to his country. But, notwithſtanding this ſyſtem of terror, the good ſenſe of the oppoſers roſe ſuperior to perſonal perſecution, and at length obtained amendments which are *now* conſidered as the moſt valuable parts of the conſtitution. Even after the eſtabliſhment of the government, theſe nominal diſtinctions were kept up, but evidently with this difference as to the objects of the parties, *thoſe who meant to adminiſter it on the principles contemplated by the reſpective State Conventions* were ſtyled *anti-federaliſts*, and thoſe who attempted to deſtroy every republican feature in its conſtruction were ſtyled federaliſts.—As an evidence of this remark, let any man read the debates of Maſſachuſetts, and he will find that thoſe called anti-federal in Congreſs have acted more conſiſtent with the ſentiments of the ſtate, than thoſe who have aſſumed the title of federaliſts. Mr. Varnum has ſpoken the language of the New-England States, and all his deciſions have been agreeable to the doctrines inculcated in their reſpective conventions, and yet he has been peculiarly ſingled out, as a diſorganizer and an enemy to the conſtitution. The gentlemen from Virginia have been uniform in their adherence to the original principles of the Northern States. Mr. Jefferſon, in all his meaſures, has ſtrictly conformed to the ſpirit which pervaded Maſſachuſetts, New-Hampſhire, Rhode-Iſland and even Connecticut.—Taking the debates in Convention as the teſt of federaliſm, I will appeal to every American, whether the oppoſition of the pretended federaliſts to particular characters, has not been in proportion to their attachment to the fundamental principles of the conſtitution, as contemplated at the period of its adoption? Why was General Dearborne calumniated when brought forward as a mem-

ber for Congreſs? Was it that he had abandoned the ground on which the government was eſtabliſhed?—No—but the truth is that he adhered to all thoſe radical points which gave energy to the debates in Convention, and which finally deſtroyed the force of oppoſition to its adoption. Why has Judge Lincoln been oppoſed; is it becauſe he had a diſpoſition to deſtroy government and *demoralize* ſociety?—No—his integrity led him to maintain the pure principles of the Conſtitution, and when the enemies of our national happineſs found him tenacious of the rights of the people, they attempted to injure his reputation by ſlander and defamation. I I could go on to mention individuals, but the catalogue needs no enumeration.

Fellow-Citizens—It is time to recur to firſt principles, and in order to aſcertain them, peruſe the debates of the ſeveral Conventions, more eſpecially Maſſachuſetts. Theſe are the touchſtones by which *federaliſm* muſt be tried—they are the records of public opinion on the conſtitution, at the all important period of its adoption. Read them attentively, and then judge between the men who are ſtyled federal and anti-federal. Mr. Jefferſon is, ſtrictly ſpeaking, a *New-England federaliſt*, and ſo is every man who has been abuſed by a body of railers under the deceptive maſk of friends to order and good government.

No. XXXVI.

RECAPITULATION.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

SINCE the days that our forefathers diſembarked on the rock at Plymouth, the deſigns of the enemies of this country were never more artfully purſued than within the period of a few years paſt—"deep laid plots, well woven ſnares," have interſected almoſt every footſtep of the unſuſpecting citizen. The *Britiſh treaty* was the drama which firſt introduced every monſtrous deformity alarming to the *neutral rights* of America.

At this criſis, recollect, fellow-citizens, with what arrogance a "JUNTO" erected their menacing front. Thoſe of us who ventured to ſpeak, or even modeſtly to think, in oppoſition to them,

were threatened with the full vengeance of political denunciation. During this terrific conſternation, there was almoſt a pauſe in ſociety; ſcarcely a voice was heard, unleſs to eulogize the authors of our misfortunes, and no ejaculation could be whiſpered, unleſs to implore heaven to ſanction the projects of thoſe who were threatening our ruin.

But how deceptive was the friendſhip which ſuch men pretended to expreſs! How deluſive their attachment to the permanency of the *federal Conſtitution!* As ſoon as this treaty was completed in all its parts, they ſtepped forward and placed themſelves in an undiſguiſed poſition. From that moment, the conduct of the enemy became open, vindictive and deciſive; every meaſure was deviſed, and even "bold ſtrokes" contemplated to involve us in a war. During this political tempeſt, a ſedition law roſe like a malignant meteor, and threatened to conſume, in its progreſs, every veſtige of republican freedom. An army was raiſed to act with vigour and promptitude, when other accidental circumſtances ſhould countenance their effective exertions. YOUNG MEN were occaſionally called together, (intermixed with ſome of *mature age*) and proceſſions formed, to hear, in the houſe of God, the diſcordant babblings of thoſe who were appointed to officiate. The proſperity and peace of the country were ſuſpended by a thread of the moſt delicate texture, and if heaven had not miraculouſly interpoſed, our ruin muſt have been inevitable. Even ſome whoſe *duty* leads them to *pray for peace*, were conſtantly throwing combuſtibles on the altar, peculiarly calculated to promote the horrid cataſtrophe of war, and many of the pulpits were converted into roſtrums, to promulgate the dreadful doctrine of carnage and extermination.

In the midſt of this public inflammation, a ſignal was given, under the appellation of a COCKADE, which nearly brought the citizens to the verge of a civil war. This badge was carried to an exceſs which threatened the moſt ſerious conſequences. Thoſe who refuſed to copy this ſervile diſtinction were expoſed to every inſult. They were treated with the groſſeſt indignity, while the moſt obnoxious during our revolution, were held in reverence, provided they diſplayed this childiſh trapping of federaliſm.

An old tory, with a cockade, was more reſpected than an old whig without it.

This has been the degrading ſituation of our country, during a reign of terror; the republicans have been *baſtiled* by a faction, which had acquired an aſcendancy by the exceſs of their effrontery. The preſſes, for the moſt part, were under their control, and Corporal Porcupine was the chief director of this complicated ſyſtem of fraud and wickedneſs; he was the orb round which the federal ſatellites moved.

The republican, who dared to ſtand between this conflict, was placed in the ludicrous ſituation of a man's body as deſcribed in an almanack, governed by Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Leo, Scorpio, Piſces, &c.; he was beſet, from head to feet, with political daggers. The *ſigns of terror* were like the *twelve ſigns of the zodiack*; —they moved under different directions, and each of them acquired an influence under Federaliſm, Anti-Jacobiniſm, Illuminiſm, Atheiſm, Deiſm, *Modern Philoſophy*, *Demoralizing Principles*, &c.— Thus inflated, the public mind was ſuſceptible to every wrong impreſſion, and the well diſpoſed citizens were expoſed to thoſe hurricanes of paſſion, which political and eccleſiaſtical fanaticiſm have conjured from the caverns of monarchy, ariſtocracy and prieſtcraft.

At this period of terror, the federal papers (falſely ſo called) were holding up the abettors of theſe perſecuting meaſures as *excluſive friends to the conſtitution*. But no ſooner had they accompliſhed their purpoſes, than Porcupine, Fenno, &c. began their attacks upon this palladium of our liberties. The Conſtitutions were ſatirized under the degrading ſimilitude of "a ſow with a litter of pigs"; an hereditary eſtabliſhment of Preſident and Senate was promulgated as the deſideratum of government; a diviſion of the northern and ſouthern States was propoſed as the moſt deſirable object; and it is worthy of obſervation, that in proportion as the faction acquired an aſcendancy, under the term *federaliſm*, they became more bold and aſſuming in degrading the *principles of our conſtitution*. Porcupine commenced his libellous remarks on this inſtrument, while Fenno and the Farmer's Muſeum reprobated "republicaniſm as a leproſy." The diviſion of the northern and ſouthern States ſeems to be ſeriouſly contemplated by theſe pretended *federal* papers, and no one carries a ſtronger evi-

dence of such a design than the "*New-England Palladium*"; this paper appears calculated to effect this purpose, as most of the paragraphs are fraught with abuse against almost every State, south of Connecticut. The President, and all the "constituted authorities," are treated with that unbounded scurrility which none but disorganizers and enemies to our government can pretend to approve.

But, thanks to that BEING who has ever been watchful over the liberties of this country, the DAY OF TERROR is past, and the citizens assume their wonted dignity. We can now reason, and apply our arguments to the good sense of the people; we are restored to the high station of republicans; no degrading insignia designate one citizen from another; the *mind*, and not the *hat*, gives the evidence of patriotism. The man, who means to injure his country cannot shroud himself under false colours; his decided conduct, and not his tongue-professions, is the test of integrity.

President JEFFERSON has commenced his administration upon the genuine principles of our Constitution; he seeks no asylum within a sedition law, neither does he screen himself under the tyrannical construction of the Common Law of England; he stands on a level with his fellow-citizens, and to their tribunal he appeals for an impartial verdict. While defamation issues from the pretended federal papers, he must find a consolation in the integrity of his heart, and rectitude of his conduct. He seeks no protection from declamatory partizans, but stands, like Moses on the mount, with the law for his protection. While a few unprincipled men are abusing him, (who have long followed the federal government solely for the "loaves and fishes" of their office) yet, as he knows the baseness of their hearts, he views their calumny with the most consummate indifference; such men are unworthy the confidence of *any government*, for they would cry hosanna, or crucify, for the paltry recompence of "thirty pieces of silver." Like Judas, they would take a *sop* from their master, and enter the next hour into a league with the *chief priests* to betray him. How inconsistent, then, are such people; and what can be said in their vindication? —The fact is, they are false and hollow in their attachment to our constitution, and after attempting to sacrifice Mr. Adams, they are now desirous to rally again under his patronage; but we hope he begins to discern their duplicity.

Mr. Jefferſon has commenced his adminiſtration at a moſt important period; the republican ſyſtem is to be tried under his wiſdom and *deciſion*; the enemy know this, and are endeavouring to ſow tares in the political field. The *republican citizens* gave him their ſupport, and his good ſenſe will lead him not to diſappoint their expectations. The CONSTITUTION is the polar ſtar, and while an "*Eſſex faction*" are attempting to divide and diſunite, the real friends of our country will rally round him as their patron. Thus conſolidated by our union, we truſt in God, that the enemies of our liberties will not be able to prevail againſt us. The tree of American liberty has been fertilized by the blood of republicans, and may it never be blaſted nor ſuffered to decay by the peſtiferous exhalations of enemies, under the appellation of federaliſts; or Illuminati hypocrites, under the garb of religion.

Fellow-Citizens—Judge ye then between Mr. JEFFERSON and his *opponents*.

No. XXXVII.

ON EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS.

THE ridiculous pedantic remarks of ignorant critics being unworthy notice, I ſhall not affront the public by making a reply to their abſurdities. If ſuch inſignificant beings expect to gain a reputation by my *condeſcending to expoſe their folly*, they will be diſappointed; *they* are a ſpecies of inſects too deſpicable to be *cruſhed* by the ſmalleſt weight which could be applied for their diſſolution.

The preſent number is particularly reſerved for the inveſtigation of a ſubject, which has peculiarly drawn forth the whole artillery of the Eſſex faction againſt Mr. Jefferſon. They have expended in a great meaſure their fire of deiſm, atheiſm, jacobiniſm, &c.—they find themſelves defeated in theſe attacks; but, as the laſt reſort, have rallied their whole force to check him in his official appointments.

The conſtitution has wiſely reſerved, in particular inſtances, this right to the executive.—At the time the conſtitution was adopted, this prerogative was conſidered as a high preſervative to

the government ; for if the Preſident is amenable for his conduct, he ought ſurely to have officers in whoſe political integrity he can confide. If he adopted a particular ſyſtem of adminiſtration, it was proper that all thoſe with whom he was connected ſhould be friendly to his purpoſes. This is an eſſential quality in an elective government, for as the people have a right to change their public ſervants, the proceſs of their adminiſtration ſhould be uniform in all its parts, in order to aſcertain the merits or demerits of the plans adopted and proſecuted. If this poſition is not admitted, how can a Preſident maintain a conſiſtency of conduct in the various objects contemplated, while a certain part of the government are inimical to his proceedings?—ſuch a diſcordancy of parts would be like a houſe divided againſt itſelf ; the government muſt ever be in diſorder, while there are various wheels in the machinery counteracting the motions of each other.

This mode of conduct generally, if not univerſally, was adopted by Mr. Adams. He diſplaced almoſt every man oppoſed to his politics, and appointed others in whom he could confide for an adherence to all his meaſures. Mr. Adams had, by theſe means, a fair trial of his political ſyſtem ; as every one, acting under him, aſſiſted to his utmoſt ability to promote his wiſhes. If this was *right* in Mr. Adams, why ſhould it be *wrong* in Mr. Jefferſon ? Why ſhould we not admit Mr. Jefferſon to the ſame privileges exerciſed by Mr. Adams ? The laſt adminiſtration went to the utmoſt extent of preſidential patronage ; nearly every officer ſtood ready to execute the will of this branch of the government.—Proſecutions were commenced, and every perſon who dared to liſp any thing againſt the adminiſtration, immediately became the object of vindictive reſentment. Every perſon muſt allow that Mr. Adams had the full ſweep of executive influence ; and the friends of Mr. Jefferſon only require a balance to reſtore the government to an equilibrium.

The above obſervations are rather general ; but I am willing to conſider this ſubject on the particular premiſes admitted by the oppoſers of Mr. Jefferſon. When this gentleman was choſen Preſident, theſe people declared in every newſpaper, *that the ſyſtem of the adminiſtration was to be changed.* They openly avowed their enmity to him, and ſaid that jacobin influence had introduced him to the government. If it is thus granted, that a particular intereſt

ſupported Mr. Jefferſon's election ; and if it is further acknowledged, that the ſame intereſt was oppoſed to Mr. Adams ; the conſequences which follow are, that the parties were at iſſue on the event of the election.

The propriety of the oppoſition, and the utility of the change, are to be evidenced by the future operation of the adminiſtration ; but can any reaſonable man ſuppoſe that Mr. Jefferſon could proſecute a ſyſtem analogous to his ſentiments, if he kept in office thoſe men who were diametrically oppoſed to him ? How could he move within the ſphere aſſigned him, when the greateſt part of his official agents were counteracting his meaſures ? It was in my laſt Number obſerved, that we are now trying the full extent of a republican government, under Mr. Jefferſon ; and if this is the caſe, is it not proper that he ſhould have thoſe in government who are friendly to the experiment, who wiſh to maintain the reſpectability of his character, and who are ſincere friends, and not ſycophantic hypocrites ?

Certainly Mr. Jefferſon is entitled to the ſame indulgence with Mr. Adams, and while we allow him to exerciſe his conſtitutional rights, the people will be able to judge, during his four years' officiality, whether the change is for the better or for the worſe. To judge candidly on this queſtion, we muſt allow him the privilege to appoint ſuch men as will act congenial with his principles. If he is wrong in his judgment, we ſhall ſoon ſee the fallacy of our confidence, and at the next election endeavour to introduce ſome other perſon to rectify his miſtakes.

The republicans only wiſh to try Mr. Jefferſon by the ſame touchſtone the federaliſts proved Mr. Adams ; if he fails, we are willing to relinquiſh him, and bring forward ſome other perſon more adequate to the purpoſe. Republicans are not attached to men, but principles. At preſent, we place our confidence in Mr. Jefferſon, and in order that this gentleman ſhould have a *fair trial*, we think he is perfectly right in appointing ſuch perſons as will promote the general ſyſtem of his adminiſtration. If, from a falſe delicacy, or from fear of the clamours of his enemies, he keeps a majority of his opponents in office, how can he expect to maintain the government upon that ground which he has uniformly advocated ? If he was in oppoſition to the extravagant conduct of the laſt adminiſtration, how can he adopt a plan of economy while he

retains a majority of officers who were acting under an oppoſite regimen ?

The fact is, as Mr. Jefferſon is now Preſident of the United States, he muſt have officers who are friendly to his operations ; otherwiſe the buſineſs of government will move under a preſſure, which will baffle all his ſkill to remove. Thoſe perſons who are jealous of his adminiſtration, and yet expect him to retain all the former officers, are as unreaſonable as the Egyptians, in forcing the Jews to make brick without ſtraw. He muſt have republican materials, if he is to effect republican purpoſes ;—in an army, a general muſt have officers on whoſe friendſhip he can rely, to ſucceed in any expedition.

Who are the particular individuals *in office*, or who are *out*, are but ſmall queſtions among the people. If honeſt, uniform republicans are appointed, and the government is adminiſtered on conſtitutional principles—if economy is practiſed in the expenditure of public money—if the liberties of the country are maintained—if our property is ſecure, our perſons protected, and peace and harmony prevail, " WE, THE PEOPLE" are perfectly willing that Mr. Jefferſon ſhould exerciſe his conſtitutional right, in putting down one who might oppoſe theſe ſalutary purpoſes, and ſetting up another who might promote them.

We have no partiality for men, otherwiſe than as firm friends to their country ;—we do conceive, however, that thoſe who are partially attached to Britain, and in all inſtances endeavour to open a breach between France and America, are the greateſt enemies to the happineſs and proſperity of this country ; ſuch men ought to be avoided, and never ſuffered to partake of the official emoluments of government.

Why ſhould a removal from office be conſidered an " intolerant ſpirit" ? Rotation is rather a republican principle—no man has ſuch a claim on government as to demand a conſtant ſupport from it. If the officers under the former adminiſtration have for many years experienced the emoluments of their appointments, why are they diſſatisfied that ſome others ſhould have equal advantages ? The pecuniary benefits of the government ought to be diffuſive, and no family or particular individuals have reaſon to find fault, if ſome other citizens are provided for, equally as deſerving as themſelves. The " intolerant ſpirit" ariſes, not from the conduct

of Mr. Jefferſon, but from his opponents. As ſupreme executive, the conſtitution gives him a right to confer offices of truſt and profit, and while exerciſing this prerogative, is it not unreaſonable that thoſe who have heretofore enjoyed them, ſhould murmur and calumniate him for diſtributing his favours?

His conſtitutional right cannot be diſputed, and certainly his appointments ought to be *appropriate* to the ſyſtem which he contemplates. If he means to purſue a line of economy, he would be very unwiſe to keep thoſe in office, whom he has reaſon to think have been laviſh of the public money in their reſpective departments. If he means to proſecute meaſures on the pure principles of republicaniſm, he muſt be juſtified in placing ſuch men in government, as have given the higheſt proofs of their attachment to it. If he has reaſon to think that many have not acted ſtrictly conformable to thoſe principles, common prudence will dictate the neceſſity of a change. The queſtion is, can a republican ſyſtem be carried on with alacrity, while many of the officers of government have a ſtrong predilection for an ariſtocracy? Can the government be kept in a ſtate of quietude, while a great proportion of the officers are in heart oppoſed to THE MAN, under whom the executive part of the adminiſtration is conducted?

Theſe perſons are often quoting thoſe words of Mr. Jefferſon's ſpeech, "*We are all federaliſts, we are all republicans,*" and draw a concluſion in their own favour, that, *as ſuch they ought to continue in office.* However, if we are *all* federaliſts and republicans, let us practiſe on the acknowledged principle of republicaniſm, viz. *rotation;* but theſe men claim an excluſive right to the title and ſay, *none are federaliſts but* WE *and* OUR PARTY; and *they* claim "*all the religion, all the morality,*" all the *patriotiſm*, and of courſe ought to hold *all the lucrative offices* in government; nobody can be truſted but *they* and *their friends*, and all the citizens who advocated Mr. Jefferſon, ought to be reprobated by *him.* If we are "all federaliſts, all republicans," why ſhould not Mr. Jefferſon's friends be rewarded by ſome appointments, as well as Mr. Adams's adherents? They ſeem to think that the government was made for *them*, and unleſs *they* have an excluſive right, they are *juſtified* in calumniating the conſtituted authorities, and even convulſing ſociety. They are the political horſe-leaches, crying, give, give.

No. XXXVIII.

ON THE FALLACY OF CHARGING THE REPUBLICANS WITH INTOLERANCE.

THOSE of the *faction* who complain of an "intolerant ſpirit" on the part of Preſident Jefferſon, if they are ſerious in their lamentations, muſt be very deficient in the intellect of *memory*. If we deliberately reflect on *their conduct*, during the laſt adminiſtration, it muſt bring to remembrance a long train of circumſtances, which are diſtreſſing at this period even to contemplate. Never could it have been thought poſſible, that any party ſhould obtain ſuch an aſcendancy in this country, as to *intimidate* the free citizens of America from ſpeaking their minds on public meaſures, or acquire ſuch a preponderancy as to impreſs them with *fear* while exerciſing their conſtitutional ſuffrages; but this cruel deprivation of rights have been experienced under a ſyſtem of terror, which nearly pervaded not only every diſtrict, but almoſt every family throughout the United States; the operation in many inſtances has been ſo effectual, that elections have been decided under the dreaded apprehenſions of this vindictive influence. Threats and menaces have been the irreſiſtible arguments, and votes have often been obtained by the arbitrary interference of men, whoſe hardened hearts exulted at the proſpect of inflicting penury on thoſe who dared to counteract their deſigns. This mode of conduct was ſtriking at the foundation of a republican government, as the baſis of its conſtruction is immediately connected with the free and unbiaſſed principles of each individual in ſociety. *Private opinion* in the aggregate muſt form the public ſentiment, for while every citizen has a right to judge on the conduct of public officers, and to vote in moſt caſes in their election, the ultimate deciſion depends on the majority of electors acting in their individual capacity. This freedom of inveſtigation and action are the privileges guaranteed by the conſtitution, and no man ought to be intimidated from the full exerciſe of theſe rights, or denounced as an enemy to his country, while diſcharging *in a legal manner* (with the ſpirit of *candour* and *moderation*) this important duty.

The republicans are willing to take this broad ground as it relates to Mr. Jefferſon; they do not wiſh to check the moſt ſubtle animadverſions on his meaſures; his enemies have an uncontroled right to offer their remarks on all his proceedings. If they pleaſe, they may cenſure his plans, or propoſe others; but, if this freedom is allowed them, and, if in fact they improve it to the utmoſt latitude, let them only be ſo *candid*, as not to charge the republicans with exerciſing an unrelenting ſpirit of perſecution towards them.

It is truly laughable to ſee in the *jacobin* papers, ſuch as the *Centinel*, *Palladium*, *Commercial Gazette*, *Port Folio*, &c. the moſt intolerable abuſe on the Preſident, and all the conſtituted authorities; and yet, while they are permitted to continue their billingſgate without any check by proſecutions, or perſonal inſult, are crying in the moſt lamentable ſtrains againſt the intolerant and perſecuting ſpirit of republicans. I would aſk theſe ſlanderers, in what inſtance this vindictive ſpirit has prevailed? Are any of their friends impriſoned for their libels? Or are any under the laſh of the ſedition law? Why do they complain of perſecution, when they are ſuffered to vent the utmoſt malignancy of their ſpleen, arrogance, and reſentment? Do they not purſue their courſes of defamation as rapidly as the preſſes can diſgorge them, or the ſeveral poſts can circulate them? Every day in the week they are handed to the public----almoſt every houſe is ſupplied with them----colleges, academies, and ſchools are liberally furniſhed with "line upon line, and precept upon precept," here a *little* and there a *good deal*. What then, in the name of common ſenſe would theſe *infuriated jacobins* want? Nobody moleſts them, they ſpeak as they pleaſe, write as they pleaſe, and publiſh what they pleaſe, and yet they are ſo unreaſonable as to complain of a rigid ſpirit of perſecution.

If theſe *high-toned jacobins* will ſay what will be ſatisfactory to them, if it is not too unreaſonable, poſſibly they may be indulged in their requeſt. But the fact is, they want Mr. Jefferſon to iſſue a proclamation, declaring that HIS ENEMIES poſſeſs *all the religion*, *all the morality*, *all the virtue*, *all the property*, *all the patriotiſm*, *all the wiſdom and all the honeſty in the country*----and that HIS FRIENDS are a body of miſcreants, deſtitute of religion, morality, honeſty, &c. and *as ſuch*, were unworthy of *his confidence*. Nay, they wiſh him

to go further, and denounce every man who *voted for him* or *spoke in his favour*, as a disorganizer, deist, and robber. I would ask these *modest gentlemen*, whether this declaration would satisfy them? Whether this humble acknowledgment on the part of Mr. Jefferson would remove their complaints against him? Would they cease abusing him, if he should give it under his *hand and seal*, that every office in government should be filled by his most inveterate opponents? That they should have the exclusive patronage of government, and still have it in their power to treat with the grossest indignity every man who was friendly to his election?

As the controversy now stands, I do not see that any thing short of such a manifesto will suit them. For they are permitted to speak in the public papers a language somewhat similar to this—they constantly vilify the President, and call his adherents plunderers and villains—they are suffered without molestation to use epithets the most degrading; notwithstanding which, they keep up a constant cry about the *intolerant spirit* of the republicans. Permit me, *modest gentlemen*, again to ask, who among you is persecuted? In general you strut about the streets with your usual hauteur, though in some particulars a little more cautious in your *personal insult*; none of you are under bonds to appear at the District Courts to answer for libels. Your funds have risen rapidly since the election of Mr. Jefferson, and every thing appears perfectly secure within the alcoves of the federal insurance offices. The *respectable corps of negociators* are as busy in their speculations as usual, and each of them sits within his little *snug department* in State-Street, like Patience on a monument, having none to make him afraid. Where then, modest gentlemen, is the danger? Wherein are you injured? Be calm, be composed, there is no danger but what arises within your own distempered pericranium.

For the sake of argument, let these persons be placed in the situation which was experienced by the republicans, about three years back. If the same spirit had now prevailed *against them*, as was exercised *by them*, during those periods, they would be justified in reprobating the spirit of persecution. Suppose the republicans had adopted a black insignia under the appellation of a *Cockade*; threatened to send every one who refused to wear it within the lines of the enemy; pointed the "finger of scorn" at those who had resolution enough to withstand their threats and insolence;

and had employed a number of bullying editors to traduce the characters of such as would not submit to the imposition : Suppose further, that the republicans had employed a number of hireling priests to anathematize in the *pulpit*, while they were defaming in the *papers*—to propagate falsehoods on Fast and Thanksgiving days, under the deceptive mask of sermons and pious discourses: Admit further, that the judges were fulminating their common law against the Centinel, Palladium, &c. as they formerly did against the Chronicle, Aurora, &c.—that the editors were imprisoned and fined for their attempts to bring the " President into contempt" : Suppose that a member of the legislature should have the impudence to anticipate a decision of that body, by declaring his opponents " *a contemptible minority*" : Admit further, that the republicans forced themselves into all social circles, and erected the standard of persecution even amidst institutions, established on the broad basis of benevolence and " *relief in distress*"—that the wicked spirit of intolerance should poison the streams of friendship and mutual safety—that sycophants should become so base and destitute of principle, as to disturb in such meetings that order and fraternity which ever characterised the citizens of Boston. The ignominy of such conduct must be forever reprobated, while honour and urbanity are esteemed essential requisites to designate the reputation of gentlemen.

A review of past times is requisite, in order to exhibit a portrait which must sicken those who gave the finishing strokes to the picture. Federalism was distorted, and displayed the features of a monster ; instead of the pleasing deportment of good fellowship and brotherly affection, it more nearly assumed the hostile attitude of an assassin, and its terrific menaces were the powerful weapon which proselyted its votaries. The most abandoned of our citizens basked in some instances under the patronage of its title, and screened themselves while practising their villany under the specious garb of *federalism*. The honest man often suffered by the appellation of *jacobinism*, and the rogue as often matured his projects by the imposing term of *federalism*.—Thank God, the public mind is now at rest, and principle, and not terror is the order of the day.

No. XXXIX.

TO "OLD-BRICK."

THE high eſtimation in which I hold the religious ſociety under the appellation of the "*Old-Brick*," led me to peruſe your addreſs in the *Commercial Gazette* with peculiar attention. The venerable and reſpectable characters which have officiated in that eccleſiaſtical department, naturally excited an idea, that whoever aſſumed this ſignature would claim a particular reſpect, not only from the force of his arguments, but the decency with which they were communicated. The names of a Chauncy and a Clark will be ever eſteemed, while energy of reaſoning and purity of compoſition are conſidered as prominent characteriſtics to deſignate the ſcholar and gentleman.

But, ſir, how great was my diſappointment in finding you ſo deficient in every point which could impreſs that veneration which I anticipated in your addreſs. Inſtead of that perfection of erudition and propriety of expreſſion, which ever gave the "Firſt Church" the *firſt reputation* in the literary world, the moſt ſordid vulgarity and the moſt ſuperficial reaſoning diſgrace the publication. As a friend to that religious ſociety, I feel mortified in obſerving ſuch billingſgate language attached to ſo reſpectable a ſignature. Since the corner-ſtone of that ancient building was laid, it is the firſt time that the *Old-Brick* was diſgraced with calumny inſtead of argument, or ſcurrility inſtead of decency.

As a proof of my obſervations, I will quote a few of your remarks, and, if you are not deſtitute of ſenſibility, the flagrancy of your inſult on the Preſident will be ſufficient to excite in your mind an abhorrence of your late publication. You ſay—"I wiſh to cover the defects of the *preſent*, under the merits of the *laſt*, *adminiſtration*; but this (you add) is impoſſible; for we might as well endeavour to aſſimilate Waſhington with Robeſpierre, as Adams with Jefferſon." Now, Sir, pauſe a moment on the inference naturally drawn by this ungenerous remark on Mr. Jefferſon—You place him in a character analogous to Robeſpierre; the burden of proof therefore lies on you, to produce any ſimilitude between the two characters. The cruelty and inhumanity of one has become

proverbial ; but in what inſtance has Mr. Jefferſon ſhewn a diſpoſition in any reſpect ſo ſanguinary and vindictive ? Has he diſplayed a temper in any degree ſimilar to Robeſpierre ? Has he erected a guillotine, or purſued his enemies with that unrelenting ſpirit which marked the footſteps of this tyrant ? Even if we quit the deteſtable character of Robeſpierre, and compare Mr. Jefferſon with Mr. Adams, the magnanimity of his conduct is not depreciated. Has he, amidſt the torrent of abuſe heaped upon him in the papers, ordered any proſecutions againſt the authors, or are any of the editors preſented in the federal courts to anſwer for their defamation ? Even you, Sir, feel a ſecurity in the lenity of his adminiſtration ;—for, let me aſk you, whether you would have dared to write in the ſame ſtrain againſt Mr. *Adams*, as you have done againſt Mr. *Jefferſon ?* Would you have had the impudence and aſſurance to aſſert, as you now do, " that Mr. Jefferſon, after a few years trial, like ſome *impure metal*, will melt away, and nothing but the droſs remain" ?

Is this, Sir, a language which you ought to uſe towards the Supreme Executive of the United States ? Have you a right to arraign his adminiſtration, and denounce him at this early period of his political exiſtence ? Will the removal of a few officers juſtify ſuch a ſevere condemnation of his future conduct ? Have you the effrontery to place the happineſs and proſperity of this country on the patronage beſtowed on a ſelect body of men, who have hitherto been employed in the lucrative functions of the government ? Or will you preſume to declare, that Mr. Jefferſon will " melt away and become as droſs" ! becauſe he has exerciſed his prerogative in giving the principle of rotation its proper operation ? Pray, Sir, examine the characters who now hold offices, and let me aſk you, whether they are not men equally entitled to preſidential patronage, as thoſe who have heretofore enjoyed it ? From poverty, have not many of them riſen to affluence ? Why then, Sir, let me aſk you, ſhould other citizens be excluded from equal benefits ?

If, Sir, you had written ſuch a pointed libel on Mr. Adams, as you have againſt Mr. Jefferſon, you would have been arraigned before the judiciary tribunal, and nothing ſhort of your EARS would have atoned for the criminality of your allegations. In ſhort, permit me to tell you, *Old-Brick*, the publications of ſuch infuriated

jacobins as yourself are full proofs of the mildness of Mr. Jefferson's administration; and, with confidence I will further say, that you are so completely destitute of common civility, and at the same time so fraught with ignorance, that you take an advantage of his lenity in propagating your disorganizing principles. Your party are not capable of distinguishing between the mildness of the present, and the severity of the last, administration. If Mr. Jefferson should pursue them in the same manner as was formerly practised, their personal cowardice would be a sufficient "*gag-act*" to check their insolence. Their cause is so infamous, that they would not have resolution enough openly to avow their sentiments before a judiciary tribunal, though they may under the present *system of moderation* have temerity sufficient to declare the wickedness of their intentions. It is a happy circumstance, that the sedition law is repealed, as we can now judge how far their evil designs extend, and to what lengths they contemplated their measures, to overturn the republican principles of our country.

However, Sir, I will if possible endeavour to bring your remarks into some argumentative order, (though they are so deranged it is difficult to place them in any accurate form.) You say, that "*reasonable men* did suppose from Mr. Jefferson's speech, that he would pursue a system friendly to the good of the community, but we find the reverse has been the case, and from *all* present appearances, is likely to be so." Now, Sir, I would ask you, wherein he has pursued a system unfriendly to the community? It is true he has displaced some men, and put others in their room. If this is the case, it does not follow, that the former were the most worthy, and the latter the most unworthy. If you assert, that "his system is unfriendly to the community," it lies with you to *prove it*. Bring forward your characters, and let us try them by the touchstone of rectitude and ability. Is displacing the naval agent in Boston unfriendly to the community? Is restoring Messrs. Whipple and Gardner attended with disagreeable consequences? Is superceding the district attorney a matter of public lamentation, as it respects integrity or talents? Is the appointment of Messrs. Madison, Lincoln, Dearborne, and Gallatin, at the head of their respective departments, unfriendly to the community? Is forwarding the treaty to France, in the most *expeditious* and *dignified* manner, injurious to the commercial interest of the United

States? Is the syſtem of economy, propoſed by him, deſtructive to the general happineſs? Or will the ſaving of twenty thouſand dollars annually, by aboliſhing the office of inſpectors, "ſpeedily ſink us into the gulph of anarchy"? If he has done any thing worthy of cenſure, point it out in *ſpecific terms*, and do not, as a 'friend to order,' ſtigmatize his conduct by general charges, without one evidence to ſupport them.

I am aware that you will anſwer, that Mr. Gallatin's appointment was injurious to the community. But, Sir, don't be too haſty in this particular; you are not yet competent to judge on this queſtion. Time will diſcover the propriety of Mr. Jefferſon's conduct, in this inſtance; wait at leaſt till the meeting of Congreſs, and I believe that his communications on the ſubject of revenue, will convince "The People" of the wiſdom of the executive, in ſelecting that gentleman for this department. The appointment of Mr. Biſhop, you may ſay, is injurious to the community; but I am well informed, that the office of Collector in the port of New-Haven, has never been more regularly and honeſtly conducted than ſince his officiality.

Now, ſir, as you have preſumed to come forward and charge Mr. Jefferſon "as purſuing a ſyſtem injurious to the community," I challenge you to produce your *ſpecific charges*. It is needleſs to alarm the public with vague declarations. If you have any thing to allege, place yourſelf in the poſition of an *honeſt man*, and give the citizens the charges of crimination *in detail*. In this caſe, I am willing to meet you; but while you deal in ſcurrility and defamation, notwithſtanding you take the reſpectable ſignature of "*Old-Brick*," yet, Sir, as I reſpect *truth* rather than *names*, your lucubrations (while they bear their preſent aſperity) will be ever eſtimated by me as the malignant effuſions of a diſappointed, mortified, diſorganizing partizan. Your ſuggeſtions are unfounded, your charges are *falſe*, and nothing but the mildneſs of THE MAN whom you calumniate, gives you confidence to purſue your ſcurrility and invective. If you have any modeſty eraſe your ſignature, and no longer diſgrace the *Old-Brick* with your uncandid and indecent publications.

No. XL.

ON THE CARRYING TRADE.

"'Tis from experience that we reason best."

AS the great commercial privilege of the CARRYING TRADE is ridiculed, and almoſt reprobated by our *modern federaliſts*, it is proper while contemplating this ſubject, that we produce ſuch evidence as will ſubſtantiate the ſentiments of the *republicans*, in oppoſition to a doctrine ſo deſtructive to the intereſt of the United States. It is a happy circumſtance, while conſidering this important queſtion, that we can appeal to thoſe who formerly came forward in ſupport of our commercial rights; and though a few may have apoſtatized from their avowed principles, yet it is hoped that a majority of the citizens retain their old opinions, unbiaſſed either by the ſmiles or frowns of their opponents. *Freemen* examine the *propriety of things*, and ſcorn to be influenced by the low, contemptible paſſion of *private intereſt*.

Being in poſſeſſion of documents which cannot be controverted, I ſhall purſue a courſe of inquiry, founded on the ſentiments of thoſe individuals who took a lead in our commercial controverſy with England, in the year 1785. If I am oppoſed by the modern federaliſts, it is incumbent on the gentlemen who wrote the following *Circular Letter*, to vindicate my obſervations, if they are deſirous to ſubſtantiate a reputation for political conſiſtency and integrity. Their letter conveys a ſtrong idea of the importance of the CARRYING TRADE; it portrays the pernicious tendency of Britiſh reſidents, and expreſſes, in the moſt forcible language, an abhorrence of thoſe reſtrictions which expoſed the commerce of America to the uncontroled impoſitions of the Britiſh nation. While examining this ſubject, I ſhall pay due reſpect to the character of each individual; but, at the ſame time, as *principle* is my object, I ſhall cloſe with ſuch obſervations as will oblige ſome of them to acknowledge, either that they were *wrong* in 1785, or that I am *right* in 1801.

W

This subject is important as it relates to the *young American merchant*, *tradesman*, and *manufacturer*, and as their interest is so immediately concerned in the question, I must request their particular attention to the numbers which may be appropriated to its consideration.

As introductory to my remarks, I shall insert the following Letter, written to the several states in the year 1785, on the arrival of a few British merchants in the town of Boston. The alarm excited at that period among the American merchants, will convince the *young men* that the MONOPOLY of our trade was considered as the inevitable consequence of permitting British residents to enjoy equal advantages with our own citizens. The agitation which prevailed at that time on the restrictions of our commerce, will fully shew how far the CARRYING TRADE was contemplated as the *palladium* of our commerce, agriculture and manufactures.

[*CIRCULAR.*]

"BOSTON, APRIL 22d, 1785.

"*GENTLEMEN,*

"WE being appointed by the merchants, traders and others, citizens of this town, to write to the merchants of the several seaports throughout the United States, on the alarming situation of our commercial intercourse with Great-Britain, do, in their names address you on the subject; which, we doubt not, you will think with us, requires mature deliberation, as well as the *most spirited* and vigorous exertions to be properly arranged.

"Happy should we be, if we could devise some plan which would effectually produce, and lastingly cement, that union of sentiment, on which so effectually depend the advantage and stability of the commerce of this country: we do not, however, presume to dictate what is best to be done in this critical situation of our affairs; but conceive it highly necessary to have a free communication of the sentiments of the mercantile interest; as on measures which may be adopted in consequence of this correspondence, some permanent and beneficial purposes may be effected.

"The CARRYING TRADE, so important to this country, is also essentially affected; and Great-Britain is endeavouring, by every means in her power, to annihilate it—by prohibiting the entry of our ships in her West-India colonies—discouraging, and

(by rumours which are generally exaggerated) preventing her own manufactures, intended for our consumption, from being shipped in American bottoms, unless burthened with an extra charge—by employing her vessels—by depriving our ships of the privilege of carrying the produce of our own country to Quebec, Newfoundland, &c.—and, by restricting the sale of them in any part of the British domains, confiscating the property in some instances, and subjecting it to duties equal to a prohibition in others; while the subjects of that nation are permitted to send their vessels to any part of the continent for bread, flour, tobacco, rice, &c. —and to ship them from most of the states, upon the same terms with our own citizens, and from others, with but a trifling discrimination. A trade, the balance of which is so essentially against us, must, if not speedily checked, INEVITABLY RUIN US.

"Feelingly impressed, therefore, with the *necessity* of an immediate attention to a subject, so important to the people of America, *the merchants, traders, and others*, citizens of this town, have held a GENERAL MEETING, to consult upon measures necessary to be adopted on this occasion; the inclosed resolutions will acquaint you with the result of their deliberations; some of the expedients there used are meant only as temporary remedies, and intended solely to retard the RUIN *which threatens us*, until a general system of relief can be adopted.

"Persuaded, however, that the exertions of individual cities, or even states, without the support of the whole confederacy, will be inefficacious, or at most can operate only as a partial relief, and that nothing short of vesting Congress with full powers to regulate the internal, as well as external commerce of all the States, can reach the mischiefs we complain of, we would, agreeably to the directions of the inclosed proceedings, earnestly recommend to you an immediate application to the Legislature of your State to vest such powers in Congress (if they have not already done it) as shall be competent to the great and interesting purpose of *placing the commerce of the United States upon the footing of perfect equality with every other nation*; and to request you also to petition Congress (when they shall be thus clothed with authority) to make such internal regulations as shall have that happy effect, encourage an attention to our manufactures, and remove the embarrassments under which our trade at present labours.

"Were not the embarraſſments on our trade, by fatal experience, too well known to you to require a particular ſtatement, it would be eaſy to prove the neceſſity of adopting this, or a ſimilar conduct, by a detail of facts, and a train of arguments not fairly to be controverted, it being evident on the moſt curſory view, that the neceſſary effect of the Reſtrictions in queſtion is, DESTRUCTION TO OUR SHIP BUILDING, FISHERIES, NAVIGATION, AND COMMERCE IN ALL ITS BRANCHES, and conſequently to the PROPERTY and SUPPORT of the merchant, huſbandman, and mechanic.

"Your cheerful concurrence we may therefore in return expect; not doubting the ſucceſs of ſuch meaſures as are founded on the principles of juſtice and ſound policy, and ſupported by the united and ſpirited exertions of a free people.

"To add to theſe evils already ſufficient to excite our utmoſt diſquietude, the late intervention of BRITISH FACTORS, threatens a monopoly of our trade, and haſtens the rapid decreaſe of our circulating medium. Unleſs the trade and exports of theſe ſtates are contravened by ſimilar expedients on our part, the *commerce* of this country, and of conſequence its wealth, power, and perhaps the *Union* itſelf, muſt become victims to the *artifice* of a nation, whoſe *arms* have been in vain exerted to accompliſh the ruin of America.

"We are, Gentlemen, with every ſentiment of reſpect and eſteem, your friends and brethren in a common cauſe.

John Hancock.
Samuel A. Otis.
Samuel Breck.
John C. Jones.
Samuel Barrett.
Edward Payne.
Caleb Davis.
Thomas Ruſſell.
Jonathan L. Auſtin.
Charles Jarvis.
William Tudor.
Stephen Higginſon.
Joſeph Barrell.
Perez Morton.
Joſeph Ruſſell, jun."

The foregoing letter is a TEXT, which will furniſh a number of DISCOURSES through the *fall and winter months*. As I write only at my leiſure, I ſhall purſue my obſervations with as much deliberation as ſome clergymen perform their ſacerdotal functions. *Old ſermons* are ſometimes delivered, and probably *old remarks* may

occasionally furnish a speculative number. Having produced the *document* from whence my conclusions will be drawn, (accompanied with the foregoing respectable signatures) I shall feel perfectly at ease while descanting on the *patriotic principles* contained in the above Letter, and the *consistency* of the respective individuals who subscribed to its authenticity.

No. XLI.

ON THE CARRYING TRADE.

To those Gentlemen of the Committee of Merchants, who signed the Circular Letter in 1785, *for the purpose of restricting the British Trade, and who were in favour of the British Treaty in* 1795.

GENTLEMEN,

WHILE reading your important Letter, (which was communicated to the citizens in every commercial town throughout the United States) on the alarming situation of the American trade, and observing the name of Hancock among the subscribers, I cannot but drop a tear of condolence for our country that this patriot is no more. His spirit has ascended to the heavenly regions, and we trust receives those rewards peculiarly assigned to the philanthropist and patriot. He was always foremost in the cause of his country; he ever stood conspicuous as a friend to the rights of man; in every instance *he* placed himself in a *responsible* situation, when the welfare of America demanded it:—but alas, THE PEOPLE lost a friend, when the death of Hancock was announced. In *him* every *patriotic* heart was united, and he continued to his last breath, *uniform* in an adherence to his principles. In honour to *his memory* be it spoken, *he* never advocated a political measure, which his *real friends*, during the revolution, reprobated; neither was he *reduced* in any part of his administration, to look to the *old enemies* of his country for approbation. The patriot Hancock lived revered by his friends, and during the period of his existence, only the invenomed *pen* of a LACO dared to impeach his integrity.—The fidelity of Hancock was rewarded by the universal detestation of his defamer.

Your Circular Letter, gentlemen, in 1785, is honoured with the name of our deceaſed friend; and no doubt, was he now alive, he would be active in vindicating the ſentiments to which he then gave his ſignature. His *heart* and his *hand* ever beat and moved in uniſon: He was in no inſtance the *dupe* of a party, and never fooliſhly truſted to the ſupport of men, who were planning meaſures to ſuperſede him in his official capacity. He had ſuch *ſagacity* as would have defeated the deſigns of his enemies, if under the garb of flattery, they had meant to bring forward a rival to mar his political reputation.

Thy political reputation, Hancock, will ever be revered by the republican citizens of America! Thou wilt live, *illuſtrious ſpirit*, in the *hearts* of thy countrymen; and while liberty and the rights of thy country are duly eſtimated, *thy name* will be held in grateful remembrance! The *proſcription* of *George the Third* is a "MAUSOLEUM" to thy memory, which will ſurvive a ponderous monument of marble!

Your *Circular Letter* of 1785, contains five principles—1ſt, that the CARRYING TRADE is important to the United States—2d, that the *impoſitions of Britain* are intolerable and grievous—3d, that the balance of trade with Britain is greatly againſt us—4th, an earneſt recommendation to Congreſs, to place the commerce of America upon a footing of *equality with every other nation*—5th, that BRITISH FACTORS are ruinous to the commerce of our own citizens.

Upon theſe ſeveral particulars I ſhall occaſionally addreſs you. As *ſome* of you were *ſtrong* advocates for the *Britiſh treaty*, and as this inſtrument, is now brought forward in our *tory papers* as the teſt of *federaliſm*, I now call upon you candidly to anſwer the following queſtions. As *truth*, and a fair ſtatement of the ſubject before the public, are my ſole objects, if you are *right*, and I am *wrong*, I will readily make an acknowledgment of my error.

If the *carrying trade* is important in your mind, does not the Britiſh treaty eſſentially injure it? Does it not, by *extending the contraband articles*, annihilate a large portion of this branch of commerce? Does it not, by depriving us of our *freighting buſineſs in the Eaſt-Indies* (which we enjoyed before the treaty without any obſtruction) greatly leſſen this profitable part of our trade? Does not ſubjecting our veſſels to be ſearched by the Britiſh, and being liable to be ſent into their ports upon *bare ſuſpicion*, embarraſs us in

almoſt all our foreign mercantile connexions? Does not *admitting proviſions* to become a contraband article eſſentially deſtroy that valuable part of our exports, and expoſe the produce of America to the rapacity of Britiſh cruiſers?

In ſhort, Gentlemen, if you are *now* in favour of the Britiſh treaty, you cannot hold the ſame ſentiments you did in 1785. To be conſiſtent with your Circular Letter, you cannot *now* ſay, that the carrying trade is of the utmoſt importance to this country; if you are in favour of the treaty, you muſt be obliged to change your language, and ſay, that the carrying trade, inſtead of being of the "utmoſt importance," is but of little conſequence to our commerce. If Britiſh impoſitions were *then* thought grievous, ſurely the wanton captures and arbitrary deciſions on our veſſels ſince the treaty, muſt convince you, that Britain has not relaxed in her ſeverities, ſince the adoption of it.—What boon have you obtained, gentlemen, by the treaty? Some of you came forward in the *Old-South*, as the champions of our national honour; the aſtoniſhed multitude *clapped* with the utmoſt vehemence your enthuſiaſtic ſpeeches; the *ſatellites*, within your influence, fancied they had got their depredation money in their pockets the moment the *Moderator* declared the vote in favour of the treaty appropriations. The individuals who had the reſolution to oppoſe the meaſure, were derided by thoſe whoſe folly led them to fancy that Pitt had all the money counted out in the exchequer, as ſoon as Mr. Gore ſhould appear in England to receive it. They fancied that our orators would *terrify* the whole Britiſh government, and their *pretty ſpeeches* would either ſooth or intimidate the nation to cancel our claims.

To return, gentlemen, if you approve of the Britiſh treaty, you muſt diſapprove of your former conduct; for the inſtrument agreed to by Mr. Jay deſtroys every principle on which you predicated your Circular Letter in 1785. At that time, you were alarmed at the arrival of a few *Britiſh factors and agents*; you repreſented them as "deſtructive and ruinous to the American commerce," as having a "tendency to *monopolize* our whole trade." But the treaty admits ſuch perſons to greater privileges than at the period you were oppoſed to them—and yet, ſurpriſing as it may ſeem, you became boiſterous againſt them at that time, and *now* with the moſt ſubmiſſive complacency accede to their admiſſion.

This reverſe of conduct requires ſome explanation. I would aſk you, gentlemen, why the Carrying Trade was not in the year 1795, (when the treaty was adopted) equally important as in 1785, when you wrote your Circular Letter? Did not ſome of you flatter the tradeſmen, that upon the ratification of the treaty the Carrying Trade would be *extended?* But ſince the treaty has been ratified, has not this important branch of commerce become ſubject to innumerable reſtrictions? If the deciſions in Britiſh Courts of Admiralty are the ſupreme law of the land, will not the navigation of the United States in a few years fall a ſacrifice to Britiſh policy? Will not our harbours and wharves, inſtead of being filled with American ſhips freighted on our own accounts, be thronged with Britiſh manufactures, conſigned to Engliſh agents and Scotch factors, reſiding in our ſeaports for this purpoſe?

The next article, gentlemen, in your Letter is, that the *Britiſh trade is againſt us.* If this was the caſe in 1785, why not in 1801? If it was againſt us at that period, is it not more againſt us ſince we have ſubmitted to the treaty? As by it, we allow greater privileges to the Britiſh than we did before—we rather *encourage* Britiſh ſubjects to carry on this pernicious trade—we give them a right to purchaſe ſtores, wharves, warehouſes, &c. without limitation of time, and to purſue their buſineſs to the injury of every young American.

Some of you, gentlemen, may poſſibly think, that you are *now* beyond the deſtructive influence of theſe Britiſh reſidents and itinerants, by placing your property in the BANKS or FUNDS. But reflect, ſirs, how many YOUNG MEN, now comfortably ſituated in buſineſs, and whoſe *wives and children* depend on their induſtry, muſt feel the effects of a treaty, which gives reſidence to a body of *aliens*, to proſecute buſineſs in every part of the United States to the injury of our own citizens. In a few years this will be experienced, and the *young men* will have reaſon to rue the day that they attended to the artful deſigns of men, who have placed the principal part of their property in the BANKS and FUNDS, or turned their buſineſs into other channels. On theſe things let our YOUNG MEN think, and reflect.

No. XLII.

NON-INTERCOURSE WITH FRANCE.

THE *Circular-Letter* from the merchants in the town of Boſton, ſubſcribed by ſome of thoſe who now emphatically ſtyle themſelves *federaliſts*, conveys in the ſtrongeſt terms their diſapprobation of the Britiſh government, in violating the commercial privileges of the United States. The ſentiments inculcated at that period by thoſe high-toned federaliſts, are now denounced as jacobiniſm. I would not hurt the feelings of the gentlemen by mentioning them *individually*, as any man by reading over the names of the Committee, can eaſily deſignate the friends to the treaty.

If the merchants, tradeſmen, and others, in the town of Boſton, were juſtifiable in their proceedings, at the time they forwarded their Circular-Letter, we muſt certainly conclude, that the advocates for the Britiſh treaty were blameable in every particular ----for this inſtrument baffled every principle contemplated by that meaſure. We gave up, by its adoption, every right, as it reſpected our neutrality, and ſubmitted to the moſt humiliating degradation. Our Carrying Trade we laid proſtrate at the feet of Britain, and as to *Britiſh factors*, we have, in the moſt humble attitude, courted them to our embraces. We have placed our own citizens at the footſtool of aliens, and ſuffered our YOUNG MEN to become dependant on their clemency.

To eſtimate our European connexions, let us attend to the following ſtatement, as ſubmitted to Congreſs, in 1794 :

Our trade with Spain was	1,670,797	in our favour.
Portugal	1,687,696	do.
Netherlands	791,182	do.
Sweden	932,635	do.
France	2,630,387	do.
Denmark	126,000	againſt us.
G. Britain	5,923,912	againſt us.

Theſe documents are authentic, and yet ſuch has been our infatuation, that every meaſure has been taken to aſſiſt the nation

whose trade was *against us*, and injure those whose trade was *in our favour*.

When we talked of a non-intercourse with England, the partizans of Britain exclaimed that it would lead to a war; but when a proposition was made to annihilate our trade with *France*, these same men acceded to the measure with the most fervent complacency---that is, they were anxious to continue in connexion with a nation, the balance of whose trade was upwards of *five millions against us*, and break off every intercourse with those, whose balance was upwards of *two millions in our favour*. They were willing further to hazard in the controversy, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, &c. (whose balance also were in our favour) in order to form an alliance offensive and defensive with Britain. What a degree of infatuation must have possessed the minds of those projectors!!

The non-intercourse with France was such a favourite object, (notwithstanding our trade with her was so advantageous) that the YOUNG MEN were called upon to celebrate the period of its adoption—prayers were offered to heaven for its continuance—the priest paraded our streets arrayed in his canonicals—the meeting-house was thronged—the *young men* were summoned to attend the solemn mockery of the SUPREME BEING—a poetic orator was selected to celebrate the blessings of a controversy with a nation, whose balance of trade was nearly three millions in our favour.—Mysterious! unexampled!! incomprehensible!!!

This was the day of political madness. A few deceived *old men* countenanced a train of *misguided youths*, to celebrate the most impolitic measure that ever took place in our country.

Young men are not always to blame for imprudences, as experience will naturally mature their judgment. Time will ripen their decisions. Those whom they have heretofore considered as their enemies, will ere long be known as their friends; those whom they have reprobated as inimical to their interest, will soon be considered by them as the most attached to its promotion.

Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Gen. Dearborne, Judge Lincoln, &c. are the uniform supporters of the real liberties of this country, as they relate to *commerce*, *agriculture*, and *manufactures*.—The abuse thrown on them, is the last desperate effort of a junto, which now sicken at the prospect of our *real* national independence.

While such people considered America as tending to a war with France, and an alliance with Britain, the highest encomiums were passed upon our government; but now they find their projects are frustrated, they are endeavouring to destroy our confidence in the administration; but, we trust in God, their mischievous designs will be baffled, and the United States rise superior to their machinations.

No. XLIII.

TO THE YOUNG MEN.

THE good sense which so peculiarly characterizes the *young republican citizens of the United States* is a happy omen that reason, instead of deception, will eventually terminate their decisions. The author of these Numbers would not wish to impose on their credulity, but is desirous rather to appeal to their judgment. The young men are materially interested in the great political quest ons which arrest the attention of the respective individuals within the United States. Their future prosperity depends on the rectitude of their determinations, for while the aged patriots are daily consigned to the tombs of their predecessors, the *rising generation* are to experience the blessings or misfortunes attendant on their public conduct. The *young American* is deeply involved in the consequences resulting from *right* or *wrong* measures. The direction will either advance his happiness or involve him in difficulties. Being thus interested in our political decisions, it is a duty incumbent on them to *read* and *judge* for themselves.

The revolutionary events in Europe are more connected with their future welfare than is generally imagined. It is a revolution, on the issue of which are suspended the political and commercial rights of society. Although it thus involves the fate of ages, yet the enemies to the real liberties of the people endeavour to inculcate an *indifference* in the minds of young men, on the present subject of politics. This apathy is often excited by men, who, from peculiar good fortune in their speculations, are *quarterly suckled* with maternal indulgence, from the breasts of the *funds*. While enjoying the copious bounties of these pecuniary establishments,

they vehemently exclaim againſt every inveſtigation of thoſe meaſures which raiſed them to their pre-eminent ſituation. Such men are deſirous to diſſipate the public mind, and artfully attempt to make it *diſreputable for a young man* to concern himſelf with the affairs of government. They would confine his reflections within the narrow compaſs of the counter, and endeavour to perſuade him that if he is capable of ſelling a *yard of Engliſh broadcloth*, or a *ſtraw hat*, and make a regular ſtatement to the Cuſtom-houſe of the duties ariſing on them, his qualifications are ſufficiently adequate to his employment in life. Thus theſe people are zealouſly diſpoſed to ſtifle the manly energies of youth, and render them ſubſervient to the ſtratagems of thoſe who ſtudy to impoſe on them.

By this falſe mode of reaſoning, an aſcendancy is acquired over the well-informed young men in the commercial, agricultural and manufacturing occupations. A *partial*, monied intereſt is conſidered as the only proper director, both in church and ſtate, and oftentimes the flippancy of ſome within the bar bears down all the natural good ſenſe of the other profeſſions. A preponderancy of influence is gained in the community by theſe factitious means, while the prominent features of our government are obliterated, by the *modeſt diffidence* of thoſe who follow the beneficial employments of commerce, agriculture and manufactures.

Every private citizen is the guardian of his own and his country's honour—it is therefore a degrading idea, to imagine that the glory, proſperity and freedom of America, depend on the boaſted wiſdom, patriotiſm, ſuperior abilities or integrity of any one claſs of citizens. The people, in their individual capacity, are the pledged truſtees of the ſacred treaſures of the Conſtitution. They are the threſhold through which the ſocial compact was uſhered into the ſanhedrim of the nation; the firſt paragraph announces this authority, by the powerful declaration of "WE THE PEOPLE." The people are the *ark* in which the rights of ſociety are depoſited, and, whoever violates their prerogative, muſt expect to meet the fate of him who ſacrilegiouſly treſpaſſed on the holy building, while moving under the immediate auſpices of the Supreme Being. *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*, more immediately applies to the American republic.

Theſe are the ſentiments which ought to invigorate every claſs of American youth, as their education intitles them to a full pre-

ponderancy in our political concerns. They ſhould riſe ſuperior to the mere inſpector of an *account current*, and ſhould ſtudy the principles of the Conſtitution, as well as thoſe political and commercial rights contemplated on its adoption. Thus informed, they would be enabled to *ſpeak* and act on ſubjects relating to its eſtabliſhment. *Not that the Young Men ſhould neglect their private concerns, and become boiſterous politicians*, but there is a dignity attached to every man's ſtation in ſociety, which ſhould render him competent to judge on the utility of public meaſures. It is degrading to an American to take every thing on truſt, and even the young farmer and tradeſman ſhould ſcorn to ſurrender their right of judging either to *lawyers* or *prieſts*; theſe profeſſions ought to be duly eſtimated, but no man ſhould ſo humble himſelf as to depend altogether on their *infallibility*.

If the federal conſtitution was avowedly adopted to enlarge the commerce of the United States, the queſtion is, whether the ſurrender made to the Engliſh by the treaty, was calculated for this purpoſe? To determine this point, I ſhall compare the ſentiments of our delegates in Convention and the principles promulgated by the merchants in their *Circular-Letter*, with certain articles of the Britiſh treaty. How far they are analogous will then appear; and whether the ſurrender of our *commercial rights*, in this inſtrument, will not ultimately have the moſt baneful operation on every American citizen. The principal object will be, to prove the *inconſiſtency* of men, in advocating a treaty which counteracted every principle they formerly eſpouſed.

While conſidering this ſubject, I ſhall not aim at rouſing your paſſions, but ſhall attempt to convince your judgment. If the pernicious tendency of admitting Engliſh ſubjects to an equal participation of our trade was deprecated by the gentlemen who forwarded the circular-letter, let me conjure you, my young friends, to reflect whether the conſequences are not now equally fatal? If a *hawking Briton, or Scotchman*, can, by a parſimonious ſyſtem of living, underſell you in your importations, how can you expect to acquire a competency for the maintenance of your wives and children, in your commercial connexion with Britain? The late treaty between Ruſſia and Sweden is a document vaſtly apropos to this ſubject: it expreſsly ſtipulates, that "*travelling merchants and hawkers* of both nations ſhall not be ſuffered, but conſidered as

fmugglers." If this article was neceſſary between Ruſſia and Sweden, how much more ſo between Britain and America?

To illuſtrate this queſtion, I ſhall appropriate a few Numbers to conſider the ſubject. If the Young Men finally ſay, that my plea is erroneous, I muſt acquieſce in their deciſion. I have no other object than their intereſt; for whether *Humphrey Clinker* as a Scotchman, or *John Bull* as an Engliſhman, enjoy equal benefits with American citizens, in vending Britiſh manufactures, cannot eſſentially affect me. The only queſtion is, whether the friends to the treaty, or the oppoſers of it, acted moſt conſiſtent with the *commercial intereſt* of the country?

The moſt illiberal reflections have been thrown on the individuals, who dared to come forward in oppoſition to its adoption; let then the young citizens (who are deeply intereſted in its operation) judge between the friends and enemies of this derogatory inſtrument.

I am aware of the artful plea made by ſome of the Anglo-federaliſts, that, as the treaty is made, it is needleſs to remark on its inutility. This, however, is but a poor conſolation. It is proper that we ſhould know the folly of our conduct, even if we cannot immediately remedy the evil. It ſerves at leaſt to bring to remembrance the ſtrolling Street-Committee, with their pen, ink, and paper, threatening every one with vengeance who would not ſubmit to their demands. It will ſerve to make the *Young Men* cautious how they truſt to thoſe who have thus far deceived them.

No. XLIV.

TO THE YOUNG MEN.

BY the moſt unaccountable fatality, thoſe, who aſſumed the name of *federaliſts*, acquired an influence over the minds of the *young* American citizens. A ſyſtem of terror was ſo generally eſtabliſhed, that *fear* operated too powerfully for reſtraint. Political queſtions were not conſidered upon the ground of diſquiſition, but the adoption of particular tenets was enforced with a ſpecies of inquiſitorial intolerance. If a young man dared to exerciſe his judgment, or to heſitate in ſubſcribing to the infalli-

bility of certain dogmas, he was denounced under all that severity attached to the character of a disorganizer and jacobin. He was pursued in every direction with a malignity of temper, which threatened his ruin in business and personal reputation. An implacability of dispostion was encouraged between citizens, and even the social intercourse was dissolved wherever a difference in political sentiments prevailed.

In this state of controversy, we cannot be surprized that the *young men* were borne down by the deluge of their opponents. To stem the torrent, required not only an energy of mind, but firmness of nerve. Personal safety in some instances was connected with political belief, as the bully would oftentimes become the oracle of public opinion; the brawny arm of a desperado would threaten to level an antagonist, when the voice of reason would make but little impression.

But, thank heaven, the clouds of delusion are dissipating: the period has arrived when each class of men can exercise their reason, and be guided by their unbiassed judgment. We can now speak unawed by the threats of a junto, who have too long claimed a prerogative to control both public and private opinion; we are restored to our ancient privileges, and each citizen stands in that dignified attitude peculiarly adapted to his situation in a republican government. We are *now* "all republicans," we are *now* "all federalists," as the system in which we move gives every man an *equal right* in society; there are no *exclusive republicans* or *federalists*, as it respects the privilege of judging: nor any *partial law* to arraign one set of opinions before the tribunal of vindictive judges.—There remains however a small convulsion (excited by the infuriated passions of some disappointed men); but, as it relates to the community at large, the hurricane has subsided, though from its *tail* a few gusts occasionally explode.

I have, in a previous Number, reminded you, my *young friends*, of the proceedings of the merchants of Boston, on the arrival of a few British factors, in the year 1785. At their meeting, they *solemnly declared*, that "the residence of such factors threatened an intire monopoly of all British importations in the hands of such agents, and would eventually deprive the *industrious American trader* of every benefit of our commerce." If, at this period, the introduction of British factors was so destructive to the commerce of

this country, what may be your apprehenſions under the Britiſh treaty? If it was *then* conſidered "ruinous to the American trade" that ſuch factors ſhould reſide among us, what muſt be the conſequence when they have *a right by treaty* not only to reſide, but "to purchaſe ſtores, houſes, and ſhops"; to "remain *without limitation of time*"; to continue among us ſhould we even be "in open rupture with England"; and, to complete the whole, provided their conduct ſhould be ſuch as to render them "*ſuſpected as being enemies to the country*," have a right by treaty to remain "*twelve months*" before they can be removed, and, during this period of their enmity, are to enjoy every commercial privilege and advantage, equally with our own citizens? As a proof of this, examine the 14th and 26th articles of the Britiſh treaty.

If theſe are facts, let us pauſe for a moment, and reflect on the ſtrange conduct of men, who deprecated the temporary reſidence of ſuch factors in 1785, and, at the time of the treaty in 1795, were diſpoſed to give theſe ſame perſons ſuch an uncontroled monopoly of our commerce! Ten years, it is ſuſpected, have as effectually changed their *ſentiments* as they reſpect their *private intereſt*, as their preſent ſituation has altered the *objects* by which it is promoted. They were *then* attentive to *commerce*, they are *now* deſirous of *revenue*; they were *then* living on *trade*, they are *now* living on *banks* and *funds*. It makes no odds to them, whether a ſtrolling Scotchman or Engliſhman ſupports them, or an induſtrious young citizen of Boſton. They care not, whether a *fellow-citizen* is the importer, (who has paid hundreds in taxes towards the maintenance of the town,) or an alien, who never paid a farthing. Whether the young *American* is the *ſweeper*, or a Briton the *maſter* of a ſtore, is but of little conſequence to them;—give them their *quarterly payments*, and they are perfectly ſatisfied.

The foregoing obſervations are the true ſtate of this buſineſs, and though they may at preſent be unnoticed, depend on it a few years will evidence the fact. Our *young men* will feel the effects of their duplicity, and thoſe who have injured them will hereafter "mock at their calamity, and laugh when their fear cometh."

This cataſtrophe will ſenſibly touch the tender ſeelings of the *American ladies*, when they find temporary reſidents undermining the occupations of their huſbands, and obliging them to retract their expenſes within the narrow compaſs of a factor; when they find ſuch

venders hiring a ſtore, previouſly occupied by an American, and *living in the garret* in the moſt penurious manner, while retailing thoſe commodities, on the ſale of which many of our own citizens depend for a maintenance. Such perſons are an injury even to the PURCHASERS ;—for though they may for the preſent ſell cheaper than our own merchants, yet after they have monopolized the whole buſineſs by impoveriſhing others, and diſcouraged them from importing Britiſh manufactures, will finally take advantage of their excluſive trade, by an advance of 10 or 20 per cent.

Viewing this buſineſs even as it reſpects the *revenue*, it is greatly againſt the government of the United States. A man who is a ſtranger, may not be governed by thoſe *cautionary principles* in his entries at the cuſtom-houſe, as generally influence our own citizens ; a "*point of honour*," as it reſpects their private reputation, will naturally lead the *latter* to a juſt eſtimate of their invoice ; but the *former*, knowing that his reſidence is but temporary, calculates more upon the benefit he may obtain by defrauding the revenue, than the character he may ſuſtain in conſequence of paying the duties.

The foregoing obſervations are *plain truths*, though the manner of expreſſing them may be conſidered as uncourtly. If property is eſſential to reſpectability, certain it is, that a ſubject which contemplates the tendency of Britiſh factors in America, is worthy the attention of thoſe who are immediately involved in its conſequences.

As the Britiſh advocates in America exult at the pretended advantages gained by England over Ruſſia (as an apology for our treaty) I ſhall, in my next Number, compare the treaty between thoſe two nations, with that between America and Britain. The compariſon will ſhew the fallacy of *federal reaſoning*, both as it reſpects America and Ruſſia ; for the fact is, Ruſſia has obtained every advantage over England in the late controverſy ; while the United States have ſacrificed every neutral privilege by that injudicious deed emphatically called the Britiſh treaty.

No. XLV.

THE OMNIPOTENCE OF BRITAIN.

THE OMNIPOTENCE of the Britiſh nation has been ſo long a ſubject of exultation, and from political motives ſo generally admitted, that an attempt to place America in an attitude of oppoſition to her *marine mandates*, is conſidered by ſome, as the height of arrogance, if not of madneſs. But no country has been more overrated in its real commercial ſtrength, provided other nations would exerciſe thoſe natural advantages which they poſſeſs. The United States, by exaggerating the power of Britain, and *leſſening their own energies*, have originated the errors they have committed, and ſubſtantiated the benefits obtained by England in our commercial negociations. The *fears*, excited by the friends of the Britiſh treaty, that *war would be the conſequence of refuſing it*, were derogatory to our national character, as it exhibited a puſillanimity on our part, which ſtimulated Britain to further exceſſes. The declaration of our apprehenſions of her reſentment, and the *dread* we diſplayed at her proweſs, led the government to purſue a ſyſtem of depredation, unawed by any meaſures of retaliation from the American adminiſtration. Our language on that occaſion was that of timidity; we became ſupplicants to their clemency; we openly *crouched* to the treaty, though we ſecretly deteſted its principles; and thus governed by *fear*, we unfortunately ſurrendered every neutral right to the uncontroled management of an expenſive Engliſh judiciary.

So far from conſidering Britain as *omnipotent* either in her *marine*, *commercial*, or *manufacturing* ſtation, I believe there is no power in Europe more completely *dependant*, as they relate to theſe particulars. Her *marine* depends greatly on Ruſſia, and her *commercial* and *manufacturing* intereſts are principally ſupported by her connexion with America. The immenſe quantity of manufactures yearly *imported* into the United States, together with the *export* of our ſtaple articles to the Weſt-Indies, and within her own dominions, give ſuch a balance of trade, in the various directions of her commerce, as would (if for a ſhort time ſtopped) ſtrike a fatal blow to the revenue and mercantile tranſactions of

that country. The benefits, arising from our commerce with England, are allowed by all the authors who have written on the subject, and the dread excited during the short period of our embargo, proves the propriety of its estimation in the American scale. Our embargo threw the whole exchange of London into consternation.

This principle was strongly urged in the State Conventions on the question of the constitution; it was ever considered the *palladium* of our national importance. Mr. John Adams, (the late President) when in England, asserted, in my hearing, that the commerce of America was the most powerful weapon to attack Britain: and further declared, that if the United States would *unite* in a navigation act, that we could *force* the ministry to our own terms. These are sentiments which that gentleman vindicated when residing at the Court of St. James; he regretted that no Commercial System was adopted by the American States, and often spoke with a degree of *enthusiastic confidence* on the power of this country to control the insolence of Britain.

England, instead of being *omnipotent*, is in the power of Russia and America, who could (in *alliance*) enforce their demands, upon the most extensive principles. These two countries are the *locks* which invigorate the strength of this vindictive Sampson; a vigorous determination to maintain their neutral rights, would operate too powerfully on the *funds*, the *manufacturers*, and the *people at large*, to be treated with levity. It would press with a ponderancy which could not easily be shaken off, and the various interests of the British nation would experience such a convulsion, as to alarm the ministry for the political and commercial existence of the government.

The treaty, lately concluded between England and Russia, sufficiently evinces the apprehensions of England on the Northern Confederacy. Russia being the principal nation dreaded by Britain, the terms concluded on are highly favourable to the neutral position of that country. It is founded on liberal principles, and brings the business respecting the navigation of their respective subjects to a precise explanation; it determines without any equivocation, the specific *articles of contraband*; it declares in the most express manner, what characterizes a *blockaded port*; that their vessels shall not be stopped but upon just cause, and *evident*

fact; that the *right of search* shall be confined solely to *ships of war*, and shall never extend to *privateers*, or any other vessels, though armed for the purpose of war. Every precaution is taken to prevent any ill consequences by the meeting of their respective ships of war; they shall keep out of the reach of cannon shot, and the commander of the belligerent vessel shall send a boat on board the convoying ship, and the utmost order and regularity are provided in proceeding on the examination. If there appears a *reasonable suspicion* for search, the commander of the convoy has a privilege to nominate and appoint one or more officers to assist in searching, which shall be done in his presence, conjointly with one or more officers named by the commander of the vessel of the belligerent party. If just and sufficient reason appear for detention, the commander of the convoying ship shall have power to *order* an officer to remain on board during its legal investigation, which shall take place in the *nearest and most convenient* port, and proceeded to with all possible dispatch. If, upon further examination, it shall appear that the said vessel was detained without just and sufficient cause, the commander shall be accountable not only to the owners of the *ship and cargo* for a full and satisfactory compensation for all *losses, charges, damages, and expenses*, occasioned by such detention, but shall be liable to *punishment for all acts of violence* or *any other fault*, which he may have committed.

These are the principal outlines of the Russian and British treaty. The parties are secured in their property by the most minute detail in all their procedure; the *contraband* are specified; the *search* limited; the term *blockade* accurately defined; and to prevent a wanton detention, the captors are liable to cost, damages, and punishment.

Where now is the boast of the Anglo-Federalists in the United States? In what particular has England gained an advantage over Russia? Their trade is admitted upon the most extensive principles, as it relates to the property of its own subjects; nothing is left to chance in a court of law, nor depends on vague authorities, promulgated by interested judges. The treaty stands on a permanent basis, and the subjects of both countries know how far to pursue their commerce, by an inviolable guarantee, as to the articles of condemnation.

Theſe Anglo-Federaliſts, while exulting at the advantages gained by Britain over Ruſſia, abſurdly eulogize the bleſſings of *our treaty with England.* If Ruſſia is impoſed on, what muſt be our ſituation? If their negociation has increaſed the power of England over the ſea, what muſt be the extent of our ſurrender? Nearly every point which is explicitly laid down in one, is omitted in the other; *our contraband articles* are extended; the term *blockade* is undefined; our trade is expoſed not only to ſhips of war, but *privateers;* and to complete the whole, even if the capture is unjuſt, the poor American is *obliged to pay coſts of ſuit.* In ſhort, to compare the Ruſſian treaty with the American, will give us the ſtrongeſt abhorrence of this inſtrument.

We have not only ſurrendered thoſe neutral rights guaranteed to Ruſſia, but we have expoſed ourſelves to innumerable difficulties, attached to other articles in this compact. We have reſtrained ourſelves from laying any further duties on their manufactures, without countervailing ones on their part; we have ſubjected ourſelves to heavy demands for old debts, contracted by private merchants; we have placed Engliſh factors and temporary reſidents on a footing with our own merchants. We have, in fact, not only ſacrificed our neutral commerce, but have foreclоſed ourſelves from uſing thoſe means, which the commercial reſources of this country abundantly furniſh in caſe of future emergencies.—The truth is, we have *given up all* and *gained nothing;* we have eſtabliſhed a pretended legal plea, which operates juſt as the judges ſee fit to uſe it. The treaty is the *doom's-day-book,* by which we are judged, and its terrors are denounced in almoſt every tranſaction ſince its adoption.

The ſubject is ſo mortifying, that it is wounding to the feelings of an American to contemplate it; yet, as it has produced conſequences ſo fatal, it is our duty to lament over them, even though the reflections are poignards to our boſoms. It is a curſe entailed on us and our children, and poſterity will execrate its remembrance.

No. XLVI.

"THE RAINBOW, AND SCALPING-KNIFE."

AFTER the Britiſh treaty was read in the Boſton town-meeting, a reſpectable and venerable citizen inquired of the moderator, "*whether that was the whole of it?*" On being anſwered in the affirmative, he made this ſhrewd reply: that "what he had heard was altogether in favour of the *Britiſh*, and he was in hopes of finding ſomething in favour of *America*."

It is expected that Mr. Gallatin, in his report to Congreſs on the ſtate of the treaſury, will give a *ſpecific ſtatement* of the expenſes attending the Britiſh treaty; how much money has been appropriated, and how much expended. We ſhould be glad to hear particularly the iſſue of Mr. Gore's embaſſy. He went to England at the earlieſt period of the treaty, and under the moſt ſanguine expectation of ſucceſs; he returned to America, and has made a *ſecond voyage* on this important buſineſs. To know the real bleſſings of this inſtrument, which was ſo ſtrongly advocated by certain individuals, it would be a gratification to ſtate the *debt* and *credit* on this whole tranſaction. If there has been any benefit we would wiſh to know it; if the balance is in favour of the United States, or if the merchants have received any compenſation adequate to the advances of government, we ſhall readily pay the moſt profound reſpect to the judgment of thoſe gentlemen. Till this is done, every citizen has a right to judge for himſelf, and a few publications, ſuppoſed to be written by *Engliſhmen*, will never perſuade the people that the treaty is not, precifely, what the venerable SAMUEL ADAMS declared it to be, i. e. "*pregnant with evil.*" The political foreſight of this aged patriot will excite the plaudit of the hiſtorian; while the contracted, deſpicable policy of its advocates will equally rouſe his indignation.

As a proof of its deficiency (as it reſpects the *anticipations of the merchants*) we need only refer to the unſettled ſtate of their claims, and the innumerable captures made of their property ſince its adoption. At the Old South Meeting-houſe, the friends of the treaty urged its adoption as the *immediate remedy* for their grievances; give us the treaty, (ſaid they) and you give us our

money. They placed the queſtion, not as it related to a *national concern*, but as a controverſy between the merchants of America and the Britiſh government; the *treaty* and *their demands* were ſo connected, that they conſidered the oppoſition to one, equally an oppoſition to the other. When they had obtained the vote, they viewed it as a complete check on the bank of England for the full amount of their depredations, and the huzzas attending the deciſion were nearly equivalent to "golden guineas" from the Exchequer.

This is not an exaggerated ſtatement of the expectations of the treaty-advocates, as I accompanied on that day many of them to the Exchange; and their mutual congratulations on their ſucceſs, were proofs ſufficient to juſtify my obſervations. Nay, ſome of them *condeſcended* to ſpeak to me on the ſubject, and wondered that I ſhould be ſo oppoſed to *their intereſt*; that I ſhould be ſo *cruel* as to wiſh to deprive them of ſo many thouſands of dollars, which they ſhould now *certainly* obtain. I could not, even at this zenith of exultation, but pity their folly and ſmile at their credulity.

But the moſt curious part of this farce, was the *ſublime* ſpeech of Mr. Ames, in Congreſs. He roſe in that auguſt aſſembly, *apparently* under all the infirmities of a man in the laſt ſtages of diſſolution; he introduced his obſervations as the dying legacy of a departing patriot; fatigued and almoſt expiring under the weight of his obſervations, he was obliged to ſtop at proper periods, and renew his ſtrength by the aſſiſtance of a *ſmelling-bottle*. Under theſe impreſſions he ran through the horrid detail of "*Indian ſcalping-knives*;" he portrayed with pathetic energy, the deſolation of our fields, the conflagrated cities, the cries of frantic mothers and helpleſs orphans. He almoſt ſhook the ſun in its ſtationary poſition, and nearly arreſted the moon and ſtars in their career; after exhauſting his poetic fire, he at length *vented his pathos* on the *rainbow*, whoſe thouſand tints were to expire under the agonizing expulſion of the Britiſh treaty. Such a complication of natural diſorders to ariſe from a political cauſe, were unparalleled in the pages of hiſtory. No wonder that the citizens were alarmed; if the Britiſh treaty convulſed the ſyſtem of nature, we cannot be ſurpriſed that the inhabitants of the globe were intereſted in its adoption. If the ſun was to be darkened, and the moon and ſtars were not to ſhed their light: if the rainbow (the auſpicious har-

binger of Supreme Benevolence) was to loſe its radiancy, the conſequences were too fatal to be ſported with: If a weak, infirm man, juſt tottering over the grave, thus prognoſticated ſuch direful events from the rejection of the treaty; or, like a ſecond Noah, prepared it as the only alternative for the ſalvation of his fellow-citizens, the folly of our deciſion can be no otherwiſe apologized for, than the credulity attached to his infallibility.

But, fellow-citizens, at this age of reaſon, do we ſuppoſe the luminaries of heaven would have ſtrayed from their orbits? Do we apprehend that the planetary ſyſtem would have been deranged in its revolution? Do we think that the *milky way* would have confounded its brilliant pavement into chaos? Or can we ſuppoſe, that the rainbow would have turned into a cloud of ſmoke, and all the variety of its magnificent texture be reduced to a huge maſs of opaque atoms?

This portrait may be conſidered as a ſtrong colouring: but if we revert to the period of the treaty, we ſhall find it perfectly within the original. As a proof of which, read Mr. Ames's famous ſpeech; read the debates in the Old-South Meeting-Houſe; recur to the documents of that day in the Centinel and other federal papers; and though we may *now* laugh at the idea *then ſuggeſted*, yet you will find them portrayed in all the publications which advocated the adoption of the treaty. Our judgment was not *then* the criterion of deciſion, but our *fears*, and a ſtrange frenzy and political fanaticiſm pervaded every part of the community. If a man talked about the moon's being turned into blood, or the rainbow perverted into an omen of terror, we were led to adopt the wildneſs and extravagance of his fancy. The treaty! the treaty! was all the cry, and none were even *Chriſtians*, but ſuch as admitted its *efficacy;* the pulpit, on many occaſions, was the eccleſiaſtical drum, to rally diſciples, apoſtles, and adherents. In ſhort, the ratification was ſo intereſting, that circular-letters were forwarded to be read after divine ſervice.

The treaty, *federal gentlemen*, you have obtained; the republicans oppoſed it; and now, ſirs, it is your duty to point out its utility. You ſaid that compenſation would be made for Britiſh depredations; let me candidly aſk you, whether you have received as much as you expected? You ſaid that our commerce would be more reſpected; pleaſe to tell us wherein. Have not American veſſels

been taken and condemned ſince, and upon as unreaſonable pleas as before? Have not our ſailors been impreſſed? Has not every impoſition been equally practiſed in the Britiſh courts of admiralty? Tell us, *federal gentlemen*, what remittances Mr. Gore has made you, and what account he gives of his embaſſy; whether he is now in a way to liquidate your claims, and whether you ſoon expect him with *bills of exchange*, for the detention of your property? Let us know what advice you have received from Mr. King, and whether Pitt and Grenville are obliged to Mr. Ames for ſecuring the luſtre of the rainbow, by our adopting the treaty?

If ſuch favourable events have taken place, we are deſirous to know them, and we are willing to participate in your good fortune, by reciprocating our congratulations. But believe me, *federal gentlemen*, when I tell you that the whole is a deluſion, and that you will find a party has deceived you. Time will convince you, that the oppoſers of the treaty *have been*, and *now are* your beſt friends. Mr. Jefferſon's and Mr. Madiſon's political principles would have helped you, but a junto led you to ſpurn their proffered friendſhip. If you do not get compenſation, you muſt blame the laſt adminiſtration.

I did propoſe, in this Number, to point out the impoſitions on our neutrality by Mr. Jay's treaty, but finding them ſo innumerable, I have thought beſt to call on its advocates to declare the commercial benefits they ſo confidently contemplated, and even pledged themſelves would ariſe. If they are ſilent on this head, we are to preſume they have never realized their expectations, that the whole was a ſeries of federal deception, and ſolely calculated to root out, by means of agents and factors, every advantage of commerce, heretofore enjoyed by our citizens. The United States have been at a vaſt expenſe to fulfil their engagements, while we have reaſon to think that the money expended has been abſorbed in parade and diplomatic ceremonies.

I would not ſuggeſt that Mr. Gore and others have not done all in their power to gain the five millions ſaid to be captured; but the queſtion is, what proportion of this ſum has *bona fide* been received.

No. XLVII.

INTRIGUES OF THE JUNTO.

ALTHOUGH the *faction* in this country exclaim againſt the obſervations on the Britiſh treaty (as being *unneceſſary ſince its adoption)* yet the tendency of its operation ought ever to be held up with deteſtation and abhorrence. This inſtrument has been the fatal engine to deſtroy every benefit contemplated on the ſucceſs of our revolution. We flattered ourſelves on the declaration of our independence, that our commerce would not hereafter be controled by Britain; we then denied their right to lay even a three-penny duty on tea, and yet, within a few years after, have concluded a treaty ſubjecting our commercial property to their deciſions. We are, if poſſible, in a worſe ſituation *now* (as it relates to their marine mandates) than when we were colonies—we then FOUGHT for our commercial rights, and, in alliance with France, obtained them; but we have ſince ſurrendered the principal part of them, through the medium of an injudicious and impolitic negociation.

To ſay that we ought now to let the treaty ſlumber in ſilence, or that it is an *old ſtory*, and therefore it is beſt to drop it, are ſentiments which may be peculiarly pleaſing to the feelings of its authors and promoters, but "THE PEOPLE" of the United States, who will have to pay thouſands to cancel Britiſh demands, ſhould keep it in remembrance, while the "tablet of their memory" can retain an impreſſion, or their minds are ſuſceptible of indignation. It is ſo involved in our political and commercial concerns, that its miſchievous properties will enfeeble the energy and vigour of our government. It palſies our exertions, and like a poiſonous ingredient, contaminates the vital principles of our political and commercial exiſtence.

To ſay that we ought to forget it, is to ſay, that we ought to forget the *fall of our firſt parents;* for if it is not *original ſin*, it is *actual tranſgreſſion.*

It is worthy of obſervation, that two of the greateſt revolutionary characters in the United States expreſſed their diſapprobation of the Britiſh treaty, nearly in ſimilar language:—Preſident

Washington said it was "*pregnant with events,*" and Governour Adams declared it to be "*pregnant with evils.*" The illustrious Washington, in the earliest stages of the business, was opposed to its ratification; but such were the exertions and machinations of the friends to Britain, that we have reason to think this great and good man was deceived into the measure. He was encompassed by a host of partizans; though their importunities were pressing and urgent, yet he refused for some time his assent. At length, after intercepting a letter to Mr. Fauchet, under all the aggravation which their almost blasted hopes excited, they instilled into the President a suspicion and resentment which led him to sign it in a hasty manner. It is generally believed, that President Washington would never have consented to its ratification if he had been left solely to his own judgment; but the whole power of the party was bent to this purpose; he was surrounded with so formidable a phalanx, that he must have been *more than a man* to have withstood their combined efforts. They rallied round him as their last desperate hope, and by intreaties, deception and hypocrisy, it is strongly suspected, that this patriot yielded, though reluctantly, to patronize this instrument.

The foregoing suggestions may be conjectural, but it has been observed by many who visited General Washington after his retirement, that he declined conversing on all political subjects, and that he appeared wholly disposed for solitude and retirement.—The *last will* of the General is a presumptive evidence of his disapprobation of the treaty; for, though the integrity of his mind would not suffer him to violate it, after it was ratified, yet he seemed to dread the exposure of his successor to the intrigues of a party, in future diplomatic proceedings of a similar nature. The sentiments he advanced in that instrument, were in many instances in opposition to the treaty, as the peace and prosperity of the United States were in his opinion solely dependant on their own national energies, unshackled by any foreign interference to control their political or commercial transactions. If he was thus against any connexion which tended to weaken this strength, it is a strong presumption that he was not in favour of the British treaty.

"*The conclusion of this whole matter is,*"—a pretended federal party have, by various means, inticed some to accede to their intriguing schemes, to bring this country into an alliance offensive

and defenſive with Britain, and thereby aid them in their projects againſt France. They have exaggerated every tranſaction of the French, and extenuated every action of the Britiſh; they have aſſumed the garb of federaliſm, and been foremoſt to reſent the conduct of the French, and to ſooth the paſſions as it reſpected the Engliſh; they pretended that the Engliſh government was friendly to our commerce and independence, and often expreſſed a concern for our happineſs and proſperity. They were ever buſy in our town-meetings, foremoſt on all public occaſions, and when the COCKADE was the emblem of federaliſm, generally diſplayed a much larger ſignal than their brethren of this *black order*. But can any man ſuppoſe that ſuch men were really friendly to the freedom, ſovereignty and independence of America? Can we ſuppoſe that ſuch men were ſincere in their attachment to General Waſhington? Is it probable that all their former prejudice againſt him, as the commander of our army had ſubſided? that they had become *real Americans*, when many of them were receiving pay from the Britiſh government, as oppoſers of our revolution? Can any man think, that the whole body of refugees had been converted to the cauſe of American independence, and that they viewed their confiſcated eſtates as lawful ſacrifices for its obtainment? Could Preſident Adams, when eſcorted through the country, or into Boſton, conſole himſelf with a confidence in their integrity, when ſuch a large number of the retinue were formerly his moſt implacable perſecutors? Adams and a body of tories were an unnatural aſſociation? they might cry hoſanna, or even ſtrew the way with palm trees, yet when it was in their power they would carry him out of the city and crucify him; they might drink his health in bumpers, but, like Judas, they would betray him under the courtly ſalutation of a kiſs. This diſplay of friendſhip was never ſincere; but was intended as a lure to ſacrifice him after they had obtained his confidence and eſteem.

This deceptive conduct, on their part, has been amply ſhewn in the late election for Preſident. Mr. Adams's pretended friends were planning his overthrow, even while they were exalting his political reputation. Some who were apparently the moſt zealous in his favour, were in league with thoſe who were inſidiouſly undermining his popularity. Theſe ſame men would entertain Hamilton and eulogize his virtues, when at the ſame time they knew his

designs to turn out Adams and introduce Pinckney to the presidency. It is surprising how Mr. Adams should be deceived in such characters, when he had such constant evidences of their attachment to a man who had calumniated him in epithets the most degrading. If the charges of Hamilton were true, the hypocrisy of this party was the more glaring; if they were false, the insult was doubly aggravating to Mr. Adams—and yet amidst this inconsistency, Mr. Adams appeared totally unapprehensive of their designs, but in the last stages of his administration appointed a great proportion of these persons to important offices. They may thank him for his civility to them, but even this kindness would not secure their affection to him.

Thus, fellow-citizens, have our patriots been deceived by a faction, and by others well known by the appellation of an "*Essex junto*," who have industriously pursued their plans, by claiming the prerogative of exclusive federalists. Washington we have reason to think discovered their plots when it was too late to defeat them. His *last will* is a *legacy* which ought to accompany President Jefferson's *inaugural speech*. In that instrument he speaks like himself, uncontroled by any intriguing intruders. It is his DEATH-BED ADMONITION, when no surrounding minions and hypocrites disturbed his mind. It is an appeal to GOD, and his conscience, and not intended to be made public, till he was in the fruition of heavenly happiness.

It is a melancholy reflection that the arts of this faction have so far involved our country in difficulties. They have tarnished the fame of many respectable patriots. But we trust in that BEING who often relieved us when in trouble, and we console ourselves that he has raised a Jefferson, who like Joshua will conduct us to the promised land.

No. XLVIII.

THE FOLLY OF CLERICAL ALARMS; OR THE PLOTS DISCOVERED!!

THE various means used to effect such purposes, as would assist the faction in their designs to *involve this country in a war with*

France, are too numerous to be particularly recited at this period. Their aim was not confined merely to this object, but every measure was taken to raise a jealousy against certain republican characters who opposed their conduct. For this purpose the public mind was constantly alarmed upon the idea of an invasion from France. Conspiracies were daily announced; tailor-plots, tub-plots, and even *lady-plots*, followed in rapid succession. Mr. Harper went so far as to pledge himself on the discovery of some terrific plan, which had nearly arrived to a completion; he said in Congress, that he had the "clues," and promised soon to disclose all the mysteries of a treasonable combination. The party went on from one species of alarm to another, till at length the cry of danger became so familiar, that the people considered it as the mere chimera of a distempered brain. Finding these projects would not answer their purposes, recourse was at length had to the all-powerful weapon of *religion*. This sacred cause was brought into operation; the people were told, that all honour, honesty and morality were to be annihilated; that deism, atheism and impiety of every kind were to predominate; and to favour the deception, a few clergymen conjured up the exploded publications of Robison and Barruel, to forward their system of fanaticism. The *illuminati* was the *watch-word* of the party; but the principal light arising from the subject, served only to make a certain Reverend Doctor appear more conspicuously ridiculous. Sermons were published on this occasion, and marginal notes introduced, with the horrid story of a desperate combination in Europe and America to overturn all that is called godly.

The illuminati-influenza lasted about eighteen months, and at length expired with a few struggles, under the injudicious management of this clerical operator.—Thus have this party run through the several parts of their political drama, and now are brought to their ne plus ultra, which is, *that the President is an infidel, and does not believe in the Christian religion.*

This is the only ground on which the party now stand, and while they think the people believe them, they take the greater liberty in their calumny and detraction; they alternately call him deist, infidel, and atheist; they represent him as having a design upon the religious establishments of our country, and some are so foolish as to believe, that all the meeting-houses will soon be razed,

the ministers discarded, and carnage and plunder become the "order of the day."

At this enlightened age, it is almost an affront upon the good sense of the citizens of the United States, to reply to the many absurdities written against the President on this subject. If Mr. Jefferson is destitute of those virtues which constitute a Christian, or a citizen, where is the man who is possessed of them? If honesty, integrity, forbearance, humanity, benevolence and patriotism are the prominent features which designate a Christian, certainly no man within the United States stands more conspicuously eminent. So far from having *no religion*, he is a friend to ALL; and instead of contracting its influence, he is desirous of giving every citizen a right to worship GOD in his own way; he is not a persecutor of any sect; he is not a defamer of any particular mode of worship; he is not a fanatic, to scourge those who do not believe in his tenets; he leaves every conscience to its own bias, and instead of controling men as the arbiter of revelation, he is anxious to place the adoration of the SUPREME BEING and his attributes, on that basis of the human mind, on which alone it can or ought to be erected.

If this is the character of the President, why is he attacked with such severity and indecency? Why is he held up as the *subverter of religion* when he gives such ample scope to every principle connected with its establishment? If he injures no man in his religion, why should others injure him in his reputation? if he is an immoral man, point out his immoralities; if he is destitute of the Christian virtues, let them be specified in such a manner as the people may judge of his criminality; if he has destroyed any houses of worship, or disturbed any pious assembly, let the circumstances be related; if he is profane, let the instances appear. This mode of procedure would be candid; but to defame the chief magistrate under the vague appellations of deist, atheist, and infidel, is unbecoming the character either of a Christian, gentleman, or citizen.

If some of the clergy are opposed to him, it would be more honourable to state their charges. If he has violated the laws of society, why do they not come forward in an explicit manner, and give the public a narrative of the whole transaction? This line of conduct would appear more manly than to attempt to

weaken the confidence of the citizens in his adminiſtration by invidious ſurmiſes.

The conduct of Mr. Jefferſon through life has been peculiarly amiable : His writings are fraught with benevolence, and ſolely intended to ameliorate the condition of mankind, and to lead them to an improvement of all thoſe faculties with which heaven has bleſſed the human ſpecies. His character, in Europe, ſtands in the moſt elevated poſition, and it is degrading to our country to find men, who aſſume the reputation of "the learned," demean themſelves by ſuch groſs reflections as are daily publiſhed in the Palladium, Centinel, and other papers.

If the clergy are alarmed at the decay of religion, can it have any ſalutary effect to repreſent Mr. Jefferſon as the oppoſer of the chriſtian ſyſtem ? Will it perſuade people to embrace the goſpel, by telling them that Mr. Jefferſon rejects it ? It rather appears to me, that it has a contrary tendency—no man will *believe* merely becauſe Mr. Jefferſon *diſbelieves*. His character as a *ſcholar*, *philoſopher*, and *reaſoner*, gives him a reputation too high to be made the negative of a principle, either of religion or any other ſubject. If the people are told, that the Preſident does not believe the Chriſtian religion, it may lead many to conclude, that *he knows more than they*, and that he has good reaſons for his diſbelief. This kind of argument may be ſatisfactory to ſome, and thus, inſtead of helping the cauſe of religion, it may have a very unſalutary effect. The clergy in this particular are doing an injury to the cauſe they are attempting to ſupport, and it is the height of folly to expect to gain proſelytes by propagating with ſo much avidity the infidelity of Mr. Jefferſon.

As Preſident of the United States, he is not called on to make a declaration of his religious creed ; if he was, I am perſuaded the moſt orthodox would not condemn it. General Waſhington was peculiarly careful in this particular ; among the variety of his publications we find but little to lead us to a concluſion of his religious tenets ; and as the conſtitution does not even ſuggeſt any TEST of this kind, it is proper that the Preſident ſhould not bring himſelf forward in any point of view on this ground. He is not called on to adminiſter any religious ordinances, and while he intermeddles with no particular ſect, and promotes the rights of

all, neither the clergy nor other individuals have a right to censure him for his own sentiments.

Suppose the President should make a declaration of his firm persuasion of the truth of the gospel, still a difficulty would remain among his opposers as to the *particular tenets* he maintained; some would say, that he was a Roman Catholic, others that he was an Armenian; some a Calvinist—in short, Socinians, Quakers, Baptists, Universalists, Swedenbourgians, and Sandemanians, would be clamorous to know to what *doctrine* he adhered. His declaration, therefore, as to his belief in the Scriptures, would not remedy the evil, for points of faith are as often contended for, as the avowal of a general principle. If religion is to be brought forward in this controversy, the President is perfectly right in keeping his creed to himself.

But why is this apprehension excited, that Mr. Jefferson is opposed to the Christian system? No part of his administration has had the most distant tendency to injure it; since his election "all things remain as they were" as it relates to the church; we go to meeting with as much order as usual, and return home without the least molestation; our sabbaths are equally hallowed; the *first* and *second bells* ring with as much solemnity and regularity as formerly; we baptize our children with as much reverence as ever; the clergy are as much respected, as well paid, *dine out as frequently*, and in most instances frolic as often as under the late administration; *ordinations* are announced in our papers with their usual reverence, and there is as much *good cheer* on such occasions as in days of old. Where then is the mischief? Where the danger, when nothing has taken place to discompose the most devout in their religious exercises? If we are disposed to religious duties, Mr. Jefferson will not disturb us; only let the clergy mind their business, and I doubt not he will mind his. If some of them do not choose to pray *for him*, it would be decent not to bray *at him*. The blessings of Providence are not partial, and though the enemies of the President may not think proper to remember him at the Throne of Grace, yet we trust he is not dependant on their clemency, (though clothed in sacerdotals) but on the benevolence of the Supreme Being. To HIM we commit him, and it does not require

the benediction of his adversaries to secure him a continuance in His holy keeping.

While speaking of the clergy, I do not mean to include the *whole order*, as being thus opposed to the President; a *large proportion* of them, I am persuaded, reprobate the indecent publications which have appeared against him. As an order in society I shall ever respect them; but there are a FEW who have acted a part, which upon serious reflection they cannot justify to God, nor their own consciences. If such men would be *more circumspect in their own conduct*, and attend more to the duties of their own profession, the cause of religion would be more effectually supported, than by their calumny against the President. When he is as inattentive to his duty as *President*, as they are as *clergymen*, it will be time for the people to find fault.. Mr. Jefferson never gave such a strong evidence of his disbelief in scripture as they have of the *negligence of their parish;* and if they are serious to propagate the gospel, it is incumbent on them to act more consistent with its principles. The *Geography* of this world is not the "one thing needful," neither are the "*graces*" *of Chesterfield*, an appropriate study for a clergyman; less attention, therefore, to sublunary concerns, and more to heavenly, are highly becoming a christian teacher. While such men are charging the President with infidelity, they should examine their own conduct, and possibly, upon reflection, they would find the remainder of their lives could not be better spent, than in correcting their former imprudencies.

No. XLIX.

ON THANKSGIVING.

"*It is the* LORD'*s doing.*"

THE benevolence of Providence, in its various dispensations towards this country, is a subject which ought ever to excite the serious contemplation of the citizens of the United States. From the first settlement of America, the kind hand of heaven has directed us in the way in which we should go. Next to the *chosen nation*, America stands the peculiar care of the SUPREME BEING, and if

miracles have not been wrought in her favour, yet the interposition of the Almighty has been so often displayed, that we must be lost to every rational reflection not to acknowledge his benignity and superintendance.

On this day, citizens of Massachusetts, we are requested to acknowledge with *thankfulness*, the kindness and protection of HIM, who governs the world, and who so accurately adjusts its various operations, as to produce "seed-time and harvest, summer and winter." By His goodness, we are furnished with all those comforts which render existence happy, and which console us under every trouble and misfortune, incident to human life. *This year*, in a particular manner, may we exultingly say, "that the fig-tree has blossomed, and that fruit has been in our vines; that the labour of the olive has not failed, and that the fields have yielded their meat; that our flocks have not been cut off from the fold, and that there has been an abundance of herd in the stalls." While contemplating these blessings, may we all thankfully response,—we will "rejoice in the Lord, and joy in the God of our salvation."

While we adore the SUPREME BEING for granting us those special bounties of his benevolence, may we be led to contemplate his mercies, as they respect our *national happiness*. That this country has been exposed to the distressing consequences of war, we have proofs of the most authentic nature. Mr. Tracy, in Congress, urged "*a war of extermination;*" the question of war was solemnly debated in that august assembly; the young men were called on to place themselves in an hostile attitude, and artificial means were used to make their "*blood boil,*" to invigorate their prowess. The tory party were active throughout the Union, to kindle the torch of Mars, and every incentive which could rouse the passions, was applied, with the most artful address, to bring America into an open rupture with the French nation. An *Orator* in Boston vaunted in his heroism, and under the smoke of public infatuation, and inflated with his own vanity, declared, in his oration, that "*peace must be obtained at the point of the bayonet!*" This was the "spirit of the times" at the day of federal fanaticism. If a prudent man paused at the adoption of such violent measures, he was cried down as a jacobin. The tories completely assumed the whig ground; they rejoiced at the prospect of involving the Unit-

ed States in a war with France, and connecting them in an alliance with England.

But, *it is the Lord's doing*, that we were not plunged into that dreadful vortex, which such measures would have quickly hurried us. Suppose Mr. Tracy's "war of extermination" had been adopted, or the *heroic lawyer's* proposition, for "peace at the point of the bayonet" had been acceded to, what would have been our present situation? Instead of rejoicing, we should have to mourn; instead of a *thanksgiving-day*, we should have been obliged, (from the present state of Europe) to set apart this day for "fasting, humiliation, and prayer."

"*A war of extermination!*" gracious heaven! Five millions of Americans at war with thirty millions of Frenchmen!! Not only so, but probably with all the European powers in alliance with that nation.—"*A peace at the point of the bayonet!*" dreadful alternative! that the slaughter on such a preliminary should be the *sine qua non* of our public quietude. How infatuated must such men have been, to place America in so barbarous a position—five millions of people to demand the blood of thirty millions! How desperate must have been our condition, that the whole nation of France must atone for our resentment.

In this contest, what must have been the fate of the United States? After France had made peace with England, we *alone* must have met them, *consolidated* in all their energies? If Britain was alarmed at their invasion, what must have been our apprehensions? If the "wooden walls of England" were not a security, what could we expect from the few bulwarks we could oppose to their incursions? Admit that the people of the United States would have defended themselves on their shores, yet the horrid carnage that must have ensued chills the blood of the *humane* citizen to contemplate. If we are equal to every assault from abroad, yet the folly of those who were desirous to plunge us into "a war of extermination," or to make "peace at the point of the bayonet," must be evident to every reflecting mind.

Under the fanatic impulse of these times, none but the Supreme Being could prevent the dreadful calamity. It was "*the Lord's doing*," that we were thus saved from the horrid catastrophe of a war with France; "*if the Lord had not been on our side*," we may now say, we should have been surrounded with dangers

and diſtreſſes from which we could not have been extricated without the greateſt difficulty. HE has appeared for our relief; HE has fruſtrated the deſigns of our enemies, and rendered their machinations of no effect. Mr. Tracy was a repreſentative from Connecticut, but we hope the *religious ſentiments* of his conſtituents will not juſtify him in his ſavage ferocity. Would nothing ſhort of the extermination of thirty millions of the human ſpecies ſatisfy his ſanguinary diſpoſition? Muſt the blood of a whole nation be ſhed to appeaſe his vindictive indignation? If France had diſplayed the ſame temper, and called *for the extermination of every American*, what muſt have been the conſequences of ſo terrible a conflict? Or if the *powerful* Bonaparte had aſſumed the dictatorial language of the Boſton Orator, that "peace with America muſt be made at the point of the ſword," how afflicting would have been the controverſy to decide the principles of an amicable negociation? Such ignorance exhibited in Congreſs, and ſuch folly in a Boſton town-meeting, by men whoſe malignity of heart was the only criterion of their judgment, are expreſſive of the rage of party, and evince the dreadful precipice, on the brink of which, the fate of America was ſuſpended. The violence of the political agitation, urged on by the frenzy of a faction, placed our country in the moſt critical attitude. The criſis was important, and nothing ſhort of the interpoſition of Providence ſtopped us in our career to paſs the Rubicon, commence the horrid carnage of exterminating war, and make a "peace at the point of the ſword."

But, thank heaven, "the ſnare is broken and we have eſcaped"; the annual tribute of praiſe is now due to that BEING, by whoſe goodneſs we have been preſerved. With thankful hearts, we offer Him our unfeigned love and adoration, for the bleſſings we have experienced the paſt year; and though the deſtroying angel has ſwept away many of our fellow-citizens in other States, yet we have ſtill the greateſt reaſon to exalt, and magnify His name.

This anniverſary pleads ſtrongly in favour of PEACE, and every ſocial circle is a manifeſto of the bleſſings ariſing from it. See the venerable parent ſurrounded with his numerous family, while joy, health and plenty crown the feſtive board; the ſprightly

amuſements, the friendly converſation, the pleaſing harmony and reciprocal congratulation,—all, all proclaim, that the melodious accents of peace are more deſirable than the hoarſe clarion of war. Let the mind for a moment contemplate the reverſe of this enchanting ſcene—inſtead of the ſocial circle, let us introduce the mourning widow and fatherleſs children, deploring the loſs of a huſband and parent, fallen at "the *point of the ſword*"—inſtead of the pleaſing endearments of domeſtic conviviality, let the horrid tale of conflagration, ſlaughter and death (the dreadful attendants of a "*war of extermination*") become the topic of converſation—inſtead of the infant, prattling on the knee of a fond parent, let us portray the liſping babe mingling its tears with the diſconſolate mother. Theſe are but the faint outlines of the diſtreſſing picture.

Here fancy intrudes her ſuggeſtions. During the ſanguinary period of war, we might obſerve the pampered contractor, whoſe per centum ſtands in competition with the happineſs of his country —the unprincipled ſpeculator, who is living on the injuries of an unfortunate ſoldier; a clan of favoured ſycophants, who to obtain employment, would ſacrifice every principle of honour and honeſty; a group of myrmidons, who under pretence of ſupporting government, would offer themſelves as tools to enſlave their fellow-citizens; a junto of proud officiates, who, rioting on the emoluments of their appointments, would, if poſſible, overthrow the conſtitution, if there ſhould be virtue enough in the Preſident to diſplace them. Such circles might experience the benign efficacy of war; and while the induſtrious body of the people were groaning under the weight of taxes, the feſtive board of ſuch gluttons might reſound with ſongs of mirth, in adoration of their patron.

As men and citizens, our devotion on this day naturally embrace the ſuperintendance of Providence. Under this impreſſion, it is our duty to approach the altar with every expreſſion of gratitude; no party ſpirit ought to diſturb that chriſtian tranquillity, which ſhould diſtinguiſh its profeſſors. The pulpit, on ſuch occaſions, ſhould not become as *terrible* as Mount Sinai, but be uſed as the medium through which the diſcordant paſſions ſhould be allayed; charity towards each other, on religious points, ſhould be exerciſed; no cenſure ſhould be caſt on a ſiſter ſtate for their reli-

gious ſcruples; abuſive epithets ſhould be avoided; *union* inculcated; the Conſtituted Authorities reſpected; and thus, harmonizing in our thankſgiving and devotion, we may anticipate "*peace on earth*, and good will towards men."

No. L.

PEACE AND FUNDS, *verſus* CENTINEL.

"*The national debt of Great-Britain is enormous on paper; and has been a fruitful ſource of materials for the jacobin* Maginneſſes *to deceive the public with. But nationally conſidered that debt is merely* nominal.—*It is due from the nation to individuals;—and individuals form the nation. If the intire debt were paid off at this moment it would not add a ſhilling to the wealth of the nation; nor a ſenſation to the ſtock of its general happineſs. On the other hand, were it to be wiped off entirely with a ſponge, it would not cauſe fifty individuals in the whole kingdom to retrench one meal a day in their ſubſiſtence.*" Centinel.

"*The intelligence of peace, received here a fortnight ſince, has been queſtioned at the Southward. It is nevertheleſs TOO TRUE.*" ib.

ALTHOUGH the moſt violent acrimony and malevolence are diſplayed in the *tory gazettes* againſt the Preſident, yet it muſt afford him the higheſt conſolation, that ſuch publications do not originate in Boſton, but are taken principally from a paper which is conſidered as the immediate ſucceſſor of Peter Porcupine.—That there is a faction lurking in this *metropolis*, oppoſed to every republican principle of the conſtitution, is too apparent to be controverted; but even this traiterous combination are obliged to keep themſelves concealed, and inſtead of openly avowing their deſigns, are driven to the "*imperious neceſſity*" of uſing *foreign means* to effect their purpoſes. It muſt be admitted as an incontrovertible truth, that the obſervations in theſe gazettes are the expiring ſtruggles of a faction, and the republication of them in our papers, are the paltry ebullitions of a few unprincipled Editors, who, in the

reign of terror, wantonly pledged their credit on the validity of their political predictions. Finding, however, that the *Corſican hero* has brought their "*beſt of kings*" to ſue for peace—that the *continent* of France, ſtands on a commanding eminence over the *iſland* of Britain—that *Citizen* Otto is on a level with *Lord* Hawkeſbury; that the Tower guns as readily diſcharge their ſonorous exultations on the *iſſue* of the war, as when they reſounded to the tune of "Rule Britannia, rule the waves"—that they as readily announce the arrival of a French miſſionary, to ſettle the definitive articles of peace, as they formerly did to denounce the jacobins of that victorious nation; and, that the Engliſh "populace" as readily took out the horſes and drew the carriage of a *Frenchman*, as ever they did that of one of the *royal family*. When they find that ſuch events have taken place, the Anglo-federaliſts of the United States have recourſe to ſuch fugitive obſervations as a defeated enemy in their retreat are pleaſed to furniſh them.

Theſe Britiſh troops, reſiding in America, are arranged in various directions—one part is aſſigned to abuſe the Preſident, another to calumniate Mr. Gallatin; a few are fooliſh enough to *flatter* Mr. Gallatin, as if his integrity and knowledge could be biaſſed by ſuch ſycophancy; another detachment is rallied for the expreſs purpoſe of cenſuring every removal from office; ſome to create a jealouſy between the northern and ſouthern ſtates, while others take a more extenſive ground by pretending to exult at the advantages gained by the Britiſh in the treaty of peace. But not calculating an uniformity in ſentiment on this ſubject, they unfortunately counteract each other in their ſtatements—while ſome *rejoice* at the event, others *lament* the tidings as "*too true.*" Ruſſell takes the latter ground, and yet in the ſame Centinel proclaims the "glorious news," that Britain has gained every benefit by the iſſue of the war; that her ſtocks are in high eſtimation; that the Engliſh "omnium" is more valuable than the French *gatherum*; that the Britiſh have "not loſt a foot of ground;" and yet, ſtrange to relate, even in the midſt of his boaſtings on the advantages of peace, the Editor cloſes his narrative with a mournful ſigh, Alas, it is "too true"!

If the Engliſh have obtained theſe great advantages by the peace, why ſhould their friends expreſs an uneaſineſs at the cloſe

of this European controverſy? Why ſhould they lament the iſſue of a war, provided the preliminary articles are altogether in their favour? If Pitt is ſatisfied, if Fox ſays it is a good treaty, if the people of England have become a body of *illuminati*, by *illuminating* every capital city in the kingdom, why ſhould the *Centinel* become the only mourner? Rachel, weeping for her firſt-born, could not expreſs herſelf with more diſconſolate dejection than this poor Editor: in the midſt of the univerſal hilarity, we hear his diſcordant vociferation, Alas, it is "too true"! Whilſt thus "refuſing to be comforted," it was expected ſome emblem of grief would have expreſſed his condolence; whether a *black cockade*, or a diſplay of black crape on the *horns of the roaſted ox in Liberty-Square*, would have been exhibited by him and his diſtreſſed aſſociates, were the doubtful ſuſpenſe of thoſe who have long laughed at his ignorance and folly.

How muſt the faction in America have been mortified, had they ſeen *Citizen* Lauriſten drawn in his coach by the *Engliſh mobility* through the ſtreet of St. James! Alas, this alſo is "too true." How would they have ſtared to obſerve the populace in Briſtol welcome the London mail, which brought the pleaſing intelligence of peace, and, after taking out the horſes, drag it amidſt the acclamations of thouſands to the Buſh tavern! Alas, this is alſo "too true." How would they have been terrified to behold the French convaleſcents leap from their hammocks, and dance upon the *main deck* of their priſon ſhips! But above all, how great muſt have been their mortification to find, that the "immortal" *Peter Porcupine* had his *office demoliſhed*, by the London populace, for his *refuſal to illuminate!* Alas, theſe are all "too true."

Conſiſtency is a principal trait in a political character. The Centinel, even while deploring that war had ceaſed, is gaſconading, that the Engliſh 5 per cents. ſtand at 95 dollars to a hundred; that they have "not loſt a foot of ground;" that "the ſhips taken at Toulon are not returned," &c. But the chagrin ariſes amidſt theſe pretended congratulations on Britiſh advantages, from the 15th article of the treaty, which evidently ſhews that the terms were *dictated* in *Paris*, viz. "The preſent preliminary articles *ſhall* be exchanged at London in the ſpace of 15 days at fartheſt";

—that "plenipotentiaries *ſhall* be appointed to proceed to an arrangement of the definitive treaty, in concert with the *allies* of the contracting parties." Pray, inform us who are *the allies* on the part of the Britiſh, to give their weight in the Convention at Amiens? Alas, it is "too true," they will have but little help from this quarter. This treaty carries further marks of French ſupremacy—the "Firſt Conſul of the Republic," ſtands before "His Majesty, the King of the United Kingdoms of Great-Britain and Ireland." This certainly looks a little "*ſqually*," that *Citizen Bonaparte* ſhould take rank of *His Majeſty* George the IIId. Who could *dictate* this *jacobinical* arrangement in the articles? Is is probable, if the treaty was in the leaſt degree under the control of the Engliſh miniſtry, that they would have ſuffered the name of a "Corſican uſurper," to be mentioned before that of their *rightful* ſovereign? This is contradicted in the Centinel, but as both the French and Engliſh papers publiſhed the treaty in this form, we have reaſon to believe it is agreeable to the original. The farce, however, does not end here, for it is "done in London, on the 9th Vendemaire, and 10th year of the French Republic;" thus obliging the Engliſh to acknowledge, within the Britiſh capital, the freedom, ſovereignty and independence of the French nation.

It looks then as if the glory of the Britiſh nation was "burning to the water's edge." How the "*rainbow*" will appear after this event, is apocryphal; it may brighten, or it may loſe its luſtre; and as this luminary has heretofore been ſummoned to take an active part in our political controverſy, it is hoped that the *almanack-makers* in the ſeveral States will deſcribe with the utmoſt accuracy in their next year's publications its variation as to the extent of its *arch*, or the brilliancy of its rays.

For my own part, I read the Centinel, Palladium, and Price Current, merely to obſerve the chagrin of the Eſſex junto. Even their exultations are evidences of their mortification. If in one paragraph they ſtate the advantages of the Engliſh by the treaty of peace, I am ſure to find that the next will declare the falſity of their reaſoning. They ſtrain every nerve to vindicate themſelves; they amuſe us with a pretty ſtory about "omniums;" they deſcribe the Britiſh funds as riſing to an immenſe value; but before their readers are well prepared to join the chorus, they

blaſt their own information by anticipating ſome terrible forebodings, which intirely deſtroy the luxury of their repaſt. "They build up with one hand, and knock down with the other."

In the preſent ſtate of politics, I am almoſt perſuaded to *condeſcend* to aſk *Major* Ruſſell (this *Necker* of finance) to explain his farrago of the Britiſh debt, when he ſays, "if it were to be wiped off intirely with a *ſponge*, it would not cauſe fifty individuals in the whole kingdom to retrench one meal a day in their ſubſiſtence." If this hypotheſis is right, the American debt could be as eaſily wiped off as the Britiſh; the national debt of both nations ſtands on the ſame baſis; the doctrine advanced in the Centinel applies equally to both countries. What then will the ſtock-holders in the United States ſay to this *Centinel* mode of financeering? How would they reliſh this *ſponging manner* of ſettling their claims?—If we ſhould have publiſhed a ſimilar paragraph in the *Chronicle*, and inſtead of *Britain* inſerted *America*, the 6 and 8 per cent. creditors would have reaſon to reprobate the principle; if ſuch *diſorganizing* ſentiments had been advanced by the republicans, the anathemas of every ſtock-holder would have followed them with the moſt clamorous vociferation. The Centinel, by the ignorance of its projectors, has ſunk too low in public eſtimation to require a *ſerious* reflection on its numerous abſurdities. If we ſhould hold them ſtrictly to their own declarations, the funds of the United States would be converted to very different purpoſes than paying their creditors.

As a friend to the honour and national character of America, I hope never to ſee ſuch principles operate in this country, as to place the creditors under the tyranny of a "ſponge"—PUBLIC CREDIT IS THE ENERGY OF GOVERNMENT; republicans ſhould ever attend to their finances in ſuch a manner, as to give confidence to its citizens in their loan of money. Whatever contracts are made on this baſis ought to be tenaciouſly fulfilled; THE CREDIT OF A NATION IS AS SACRED AS THAT OF AN INDIVIDUAL; ſo far from "ſponging," I am for punctual and honourable payment; ſo far from ſuggeſting that no injury would ariſe from *annihilating* the debt, I believe the greateſt injury would ariſe if ſuch a meaſure was adopted.

The obſervations made in the Centinel, on the public debt of England, are the very eſſence of *jacobiniſm*. The Editor, from his arrogance, ſeems to ſport with every thing that is held valuable in ſociety; he ſpeaks of peace as a curſe, of the public debt as a chimera, and yet, under a political infatuation, he is ſupported (by the very men whom he wiſhes to ruin) as the friend to public credit and the advocate of harmouy and ſocial order; while, on the other hand, the Editors of the *Chronicle* have been repreſented as the deſtroyers of property and the enemies to every moral virtue.

The *Chronicle* has now come to an iſſue with the *Centinel* on this ground, and means to maintain an oppoſite doctrine. If the debt of England is a mere *ignis fatuus*, the principle is equally operative in the United States. The REPUBLICANS will not admit public credit to be expoſed to ſuch a vague deciſion, but are willing in a juſt manner, (by the burden falling equally on every claſs of citizens) to pay their creditors, agreeably to their pledged contracts, any thing in the *Centinel* to the contrary notwithſtanding.

Suppoſe Mr. Jefferſon or Mr. Gallatin had advanced a ſimilar doctrine on the debt of the United States, as is advanced in the Centinel on the Britiſh debt—ſuppoſe they had ſaid, that the debt was due from one individual to another, and, therefore, if a "ſponge" was applied to the ſettlement, not more than fifty individuals would retrench one meal a day in their ſubſiſtence? If this is true of England, it is equally applicable to America; and, provided it was adopted, how many *fat, plump ſtock-holders* would become as thin and as lank as a pack of hounds, after courſing a whole day without any game to ſatisfy their hunger. Away, away with ſuch *jacobinical principles;* the *Centinel* is aiming to throw "public credit in the wind" to help its diſorganizing adherents—but the *Chronicle*, ever ſteady to its object, will purſue ſuch renegadoes to their ſecret holds, and expoſe them to public execration.

No. LI.

RAIN AND WAR!!!

"WE *have as much reaſon to pray for the continuance of the* WAR *in Europe, as the Huſbandman for rain in a time of drought.*"

Centinel.

ALTHOUGH perſonalities ought ever to be avoided, yet when an individual has the effrontery to violate every principle of humanity; diſgraces his country, by holding it up as the reſidence of barbarians; agonizes the tender feelings of charity and philanthropy; and libels every doctrine of that religion, which breathes peace and good will towards men—the affront is ſo enormous, that *the man* who thus ſports with every thing conſidered ſacred in civilized ſociety, ſhould be arraigned before the public as a culprit, whoſe crimes deſerve the moſt pointed reprehenſion.

Under this impreſſion, I am conſtrained to inquire from whence does this ſanguinary ſentiment proceed? "*To pray for War as earneſtly as we would pray for Rain!*" Deſolation, barbariſm, and conflagration, muſt ſtand perſonified in the author of ſuch an infamous addreſs to that Deity, whoſe attributes are immutably fixed on the baſis of benevolence.

Where is the wretch who dares utter ſuch a profane ſentiment? Has Cain returned to the earth, or has Judas eſcaped from the confines of Lucifer? Has ATE "let ſlip the dogs of war," and commiſſioned an emiſſary to enrage the voracious pack to gluttonize on human carnage? Has Pandæmonium diſgorged its demons, and diſturbed the peaceful abodes of mankind with its infuriated reſidents? Have the ſavages of the wilderneſs become more vindictive in barbariſm? or have the Algerines been inflated with a tenfold degree of ſatannic malignity?—No:—Even Cain, Judas, Até, Belzebub, the ſavages, Algerines, and Satan himſelf, muſt reprobate with abhorrence the deteſtable idea! and collected in their ire, point the finger of ſcorn at the miſcreant who thus

preſumes to violate every principle which is held ſacred even in the territories of the moſt profligate. Who is the man who thus diſgraces humanity; who puts to bluſh the apoſtates in the infernal regions; and who raiſes the indignity of the moſt uncivilized of mankind? The countenance of Cain muſt brighten at the reflection, that *one man* will hereafter ſtand more conſpicuous for his depravity in the regions to which he is conſigned.

"*Pray for war as earneſtly as we would pray for rain!*" Gracious Heaven, let not thy wrath deſcend on America for this horrid imprecation. It is the ſupplication of a wretch, who has loſt all ſenſe of thy benevolence. It is the intreaty of a "biped," who regards neither the ſanctity of the Supreme Being, nor the happineſs of mankind. Let not the vengeance of Heaven fall on our country for this impious expreſſion, as upwards of five millions of citizens unanimouſly condemn the deſperado who thus violates every principle which harmonizes ſociety, or renders life deſirable. But if an atonement muſt be made for this impeachment of thy benignity, let him ſtand the ſole victim of thy diſpleaſure; and may the miſeries which he is diſpoſed to inflict on others, be heaped with manifold aggravation on his devoted head. Not that we would wiſh to prolong his miſery to the extent of his crime; but, in mercy to mankind, may he receive ſuch a portion of affliction, as that his name may henceforth be expreſſive of every thing that is abhorrent, and his puniſhment become ſo far terrific, as to check ſimilar expreſſions in ſucceeding ages. In commiſeration to the human race, may Satan be controled in executing the full vengeance of his indignation, as the *rivalſhip of depravity* may excite thoſe emotions of jealouſy, as to lead him to dread an uſurper of his kingdom.

The profane ſentiment, of imploring Heaven to prolong the devaſtations of war, muſt ſtrike every reflecting mind with deteſtation. Can any man, whoſe breaſt is not callous to every humane conſideration, deſire a continuance of thoſe ravages which attend the progreſs of war? Is there one citizen, who delights ſo far in blood, as to petition Heaven to ſpread the dreadful carnage among the innocent inhabitants of contending Europe?—who wiſhes to read the horrid detail of expiring millions, falling under the ſword of an invading enemy? Is there one man ſo abſorbed in private intereſt, as to make a ſerious application to the Deity

to diſtreſs thouſands of men, women, and children, merely to procure a market for his merchandize? Let thoſe Americans, who recollect the battle of Bunker-Hill, who remember the conflagration of Charleſtown, who experienced the diſtreſſes of forſaking their habitations during the American revolution, ſpeak on this ſubject;—ſay, fellow-citizens, what would have been your feelings, if you had read in an European paper, that the war with America was as deſirable as "rain in a time of drought"? What ſhould we have thought of ſuch a paragraph, even if it had proceeded from the preſs of an Algerine? But no ſuch thing ever appeared during our controverſy; the inhumane ſentiment was reſerved for the *Centinel*, and we preſume its Editor ſtands alone poſſeſſed of ſuch a ſanguinary diſpoſition!

He ſays we ought to "*pray for war!*" Gracious Heaven! in what manner are we to direct our prayers? Are we to aſſemble, as in a time of drought, and make our immediate application to the Throne of Grace, for the beſtowment of this bleſſing? Muſt our clergy addreſs the Deity in a language like this:—"Father of Mercies, we beſeech Thee to hear our ſupplications, and may Thy children here below, who inhabit one part of the creation, be enabled to cut each other's throats, in order that the inhabitants of the other part may receive the benefits ariſing from their wants and diſtreſſes." Is this the form of prayer the Centinel would preſcribe? Is this the pious ejaculation to be offered up in our reſpective churches? Horrid profanity! and yet this is the purport of the petition recommended for your adoption.

Viewing this ſubject on the ground of Chriſtianity, can the clergy approve of the principle? Are they not *in duty bound* to bear public teſtimony againſt the wretch who would ſuggeſt ſuch a meaſure? Can politics ſo far blind their eyes, as to paſs over unnoticed ſuch an odium on religion, while they are lamenting the decay of every moral virtue? This paragraph in the Centinel is a ſtain on our national character; and nothing can ever remove it, but the depravity of the author being as generally known throughout the world, as his inſolence is notorious within the town of his reſidence.

If any one doubts the infidelity of this man, I would requeſt him to inquire, who it was that declared, upon hearing that the lightning had ſhivered the maſt of the ſhip George Waſhing-

ton, "*This is a d—d jacobin ſtorm!*" Was it not the ſame perſon who wiſhes us to "*pray for war?*" That laments the peace as "*too true?*"

The above remarks are confined to the horrid idea of "praying for war." If the author is willing to acknowledge his error, and apologize for his impiety, the charity of republicans would probably throw a mantle over his criminality, under the injunction in Scripture, that "though thy brother offend ſeventy times ſeven, yet, if he *repent*, ye ſhall forgive him." To this Chriſtian charity we recommend the *writer of the ſanguinary paragraph.*

No. LII.

THE ABOLITION OF TAXES.

THE magnanimity, philanthropy and patriotiſm exhibited in the meſſage of Preſident Jefferſon, muſt endear him to every republican and *Chriſtian* citizen, throughout the Union. His actions muſt have a much happier tendency to promote the cauſe of religion, than thoſe of our modern hypocrites, who, by profeſſion and habiliments only, deſignate the character of a Chriſtian.

When we reflect on the torrent of abuſe, the deluge of calumny, which have flowed from his enemies; when we conſider, that every boundary of common decency has been overleaped, in vilifying his conduct; when we contemplate the malicious diſpoſition diſplayed in thoſe papers which have been the receptacles of ſlander and defamation, what muſt we think of *the man* who can paſs over in ſilence this unbounded detraction, and regardleſs of the enmity of his antagoniſts, urge the Legiſlative Body of the nation to deviſe ways and means to relieve the taxes of his fellow-citizens? Human nature is peculiarly prone to retaliation for injuries. Mr. Jefferſon ſeems exempt from this frailty—even his enemies, when reading the infamous publications in the Centinel, Palladium, and other factious papers, are conſtrained to ſay, that ſome governmental check ought to prevent ſuch an intolerant ſpirit againſt the

chief magiſtrate ; but though *he* is the peculiar object of this diſorganizing and jacobinical temper, yet far from returning " railing for railing," far from calling down the fire of legiſlative authority to conſume his enemies, his conciliatory ſpirit may be deſcribed in the following language :

Fellow-citizens of the Senate and Houſe of Repreſentatives :—forgive my enemies ; I do not urge your " blood to boil" againſt them ; I deſire no ſedition act to control their inſolence ; my conduct is placed on the foundation of public ſcrutiny ; the republican ſyſtem is fixed on the baſis of univerſal inveſtigation. Let my opponents ſay *what they pleaſe*—my actions are ſubmitted to the enlightened judgment of my conſtituents ; to their opinion I am willing to appeal, and while acting in the executive department, I ſhall never deſcend to notice the ſcurrility of an expiring faction ; neither ſhall I ſcreen myſelf within the barriers of a ſedition law, to prevent a fair and impartial examination of my character and conduct. But, "*fellow-citizens*," I wave with pleaſure all conſiderations of a perſonal nature. The ſubjects, to which I am deſirous to draw your attention, are connected with public utility and general happineſs. Thus predicating my adminiſtration on this foundation, let me aſk you, whether the numerous *taxes* on our conſtituents cannot be leſſened ? whether the exciſe and ſtamp duties cannot be diſpenſed with ? and whether the public debt (which, in *monarchical* countries, is conſidered a public bleſſing) cannot be diſcharged ſooner than has heretofore been contemplated, and with more facility to the American citizens ? whether an expenſive ſyſtem of judiciary (created under the proſpect of an immediate diſſolution of legiſlative ariſtocracy) ſhould not be annihilated, and this branch of government reſtored to its former ſimplified ſtate ? that this laſt effort of a party, to *aſſimilate the American government to that of England*, ſhould be defeated, and that the Preſident ſhould not, in the laſt hours of his political exiſtence, organize a body of favourites, in a permanent ſtation, to perpetuate his influence ?

This is the plain, intelligible language of the Preſident's meſſage. While *entering into office*, does he ſhew the ſame temper of ſome, when *going out ?* Does he wiſh to extend his popularity by official patronage ? Is he deſirous to create offices to aid his own energies ? Does he recommend thoſe meaſures which might

lead thouſands to court his friendſhip, in expectation of his lucrative diſpoſals? If we had ſeen him active to originate a ſyſtem, which would ſecure him the ſupport of a formidable phalanx, we might doubt his ſincerity; eſpecially if we had ſeen him appoint men to office, in the moſt ſacred connexion with thoſe whom he had diſplaced, we ſhould be jealous of his integrity. Nothing of this kind can be alleged againſt Mr. Jefferſon; he ſtands before his fellow-citizens on the ground of republicaniſm, and, conſcious of his uprightneſs, is ready to ſubmit his actions to public and private ſcrutiny.

The government of a free people never aſſumed a more dignified attitude. While monarchies are conſtantly calling on the people for additional taxes—while a Britiſh budget (like Pandora's box) is fraught with evils, to be diſſeminated among the ſubjects, in the form of taxes and requiſitions—while the miniſtry are ſtraining to the utmoſt verge of extortion the ſmall pittance in the hands of induſtry—while the exchequer is the common depoſit of the hard earnings of the manufacturer and huſbandman,—the *American republic*, under the wiſdom and economy of its executive, is officially urged to retrench their expenſes, and to leſſen the burdens which for many years have diſtreſſed the citizens.

This country, from its firſt ſettlement, has been fated to the clamour and intrigues of a faction. The diſtreſſing ſyſtem of finance, which has convulſed Britain, and rendered her government the mere vehicle to impoveriſh the *many* and enrich the *few*, was early adopted in the United States; exciſes, ſtamp duties, &c. have followed in quick ſucceſſion; but, above all, a ſtupendous ſyſtem of judiciary, which threatens to throw the life, liberty and property of the people, under the control of that unqualified inſtrument generally denominated the *common-law*, has been attempted. The judiciary of this country has already become too complex for the comprehenſion of the citizens; the late eſtabliſhment enlarges the boundaries, and gives a ſcope to a *particular profeſſion*, which muſt eventually graſp within its control the privileges and property of the whole community. This extenſive machine, moving under the weight of a column of ſupernumerary judges, attended with the immenſe expenſe of their eſtabliſhments, it is feared, would ultimately reduce the people to the moſt abject ſtate of ſervitude. Lawyers would

generate in tenfold proportion to other profeſſions, and, in time, this country would be as generally overrun by this "order," as Egypt with Mamelukes.

Notwithſtanding the Preſident has in his meſſage given ſuch a ſtrong evidence of his attachment to the liberties and happineſs of his country, yet the voice of calumny is ſtill clamorous againſt him. But, fellow-citizens, has he injured you in his recommendations to relieve you from taxes? Are there any who wiſh for the continuance of exciſe, ſtamp duties, &c.? If there are, let them *ſpeak*. If you want your internal manufactures burdened with duties, come forward and declare it. If you are deſirous to continue the odious *ſtamp-act*, or wiſh to perpetuate the troubleſome taſk of riding from town to town to buy a ſtamp-paper, to legalize your common negociations, now is the time to gratify your deſires by petitioning Congreſs to diſregard the recommendations of the Preſident. Ye who want to pay a tax on carriages (which probably convey your family to the houſe of worſhip) rally your forces, and ſend circular letters, to be read in churches, for joining in a remonſtrance againſt the abolition of the duty.

If the citizens are enamoured with the late ſyſtem of judiciary, and conceive themſelves threatened with an annihilation of their liberties, in caſe it ſhould be revoked, let them come forward with a declaration of the bleſſings they anticipate on the creation of a phalanx of judges, and the retinue of lawyers which follow in their train. This is placing the ſubject on its proper footing. As the Preſident only deſires to promote the public good, if he has miſtaken the means, he will cheerfully renounce the meaſure. If the people ſay *taxes* are deſirable, he will endeavour to gratify their wiſhes—but while he thinks the exigencies of government do not require their former latitude, he will uſe his influence to relieve and not burden them for the emolument of a few individuals.—He who is offended or injured by the Preſident, let him ſpeak! He ſhall be *heard* with attention, and *anſwered* with candour.

No. LIII.

THE BENEVOLENCE AND DIGNITY OF "THE PEOPLE."

THE ſanguinary ſcene of '*garments rolled in blood*,' having been ſo long and ſo often portrayed to the public, it muſt be peculiarly pleaſing to the philanthropic mind to contemplate the reſtoration of peace, and the harmony of contending nations. Among five millions of republican citizens, it is poſſible that *one man* may be ſo deſtitute of humanity as to "pray for war," and thus erect his name as a monument of univerſal deteſtation. The olive branch is congenial to the feelings of *benevolence*, and though tyrants may realize advantages to themſelves amidſt the calamities of war, yet humanity will ever acquire an aſcendancy when "the people" exerciſe their inherent virtues. Under particular impreſſions, the people may be deceived, and led into error, but their good ſenſe will eventually extricate them from the evils deſigned by thoſe who intended to impoſe upon them.

While conſidering the nature of government, ſome are too apt to ſuppoſe, that the magiſtrates of a *monarchy*, or an *ariſtocracy*, are excluſively inclined to favour the happineſs of "the people"; they fooliſhly ſuppoſe, that the people are prone to evil, and generally diſpoſed to violate every principle of ſocial order. The reverſe however is the fact, as the people are naturally deſirous to ſubſtantiate their own proſperity; neither are they inclined to oppoſe government, provided it is adminiſtered with any tolerable degree of lenity. The Americans bore the oppreſſions of Britain, till they became inſufferable; the citizens of France for centuries ſubmitted to the tyranny of their monarchs, and impoſitions of their clergy, till the nation was nearly bankrupt by their extravagance and luxury; the poor, unhappy Iriſh have, for many ages, dragged the chains of ſervitude, while their taſk-maſters are daily increaſing their burdens, and wreſting from the ſupplicating hand of wretchedneſs the ſcanty morſel alloted for its ſubſiſtence.

The ſubjects of one nation would live in continual amity with another, if they were not excited to a controverſy by the ambitious jealouſy of their rulers. For example, would the people of England have entered into a war with France, if they had not been ſtimulated by their king and miniſtry? Do we ſuppoſe that the ſoldiers, ſailors and militia of England would have armed themſelves againſt the French nation, if Pitt and his coadjutors had not promoted the warfare? No: France might have changed her government in quietude, and not one man within the combined nations would have felt the leaſt inclination to interfere in the controverſy. Do we ſuppoſe that a Dutchman, German or Engliſhman would have troubled himſelf about what was doing in France, if the emperor, ſtadtholder, and king of thoſe nations had been tranquil on the occaſion? An Engliſhman, Auſtrian, and Dutchman have no *natural* hoſtility to a Frenchman, unleſs provoked to animoſity by thoſe individuals who compoſe their *lords and maſters*. Wars are not the operation of perſonal reſentment between ſubjects of different nations and languages, but in moſt inſtances are created and fomented by men, who are benefitted by the conteſt, from the emoluments ariſing in their official capacity.

During the American revolution, the *benevolence* of the people of England was conſpicuous on moſt occaſions. Our priſoners were treated, *by them*, with the greateſt hoſpitality. The *governmental priſon-ſhips* were the baſtiles of cruelty; but if an unfortunate American could take refuge among *the people*, he was ſure of protection, and every diſplay of humanity was exerciſed. The American people alſo, on the cloſe of the war, received with cordiality the enemies of the revolution, permitted the refugees to return, and would to this day have embraced them with the utmoſt affection, had they not found that almoſt every old tory continued inimical to the proſperity of a *republican form of government*. As a further evidence of the *benevolence of the people*, I ſhall only obſerve, that our SAVIOUR would have fallen a ſacrifice to the outrage of the rulers, *chief prieſts*, ſcribes and phariſees, much earlier than he did, had they not been checked in their progreſs from "a fear of the people." The people cried "hoſanna," and received him with the utmoſt cordiality, but the *mon-*

archical, *ariſtocratical* and *prieſtly* authorities cried "crucify him! crucify him!"

At the preſent day, we often hear "the people" depreciated, and the rulers exalted; we hear the moſt degrading remarks on the *commonalty*, and the higheſt encomiums on the "well-born." But, if we examine hiſtory, we ſhall find, that war never aroſe between nations unleſs ſet on by the *monarchical*, *ariſtocratical*, or *clerical* part of the government.

To illuſtrate my remarks, let us reflect on the ſudden return of friendſhip between Frenchmen and Engliſhmen. While the king and miniſtry were carrying on the war, the name of Bonaparte, and the ſans culottes of France, were held in the utmoſt abhorrence in England; the public mind was raiſed to ſuch an elevation of reſentment, againſt every thing which wore a Gallican appearance, that it was dangerous to liſp a ſentiment in favour of the French in any public or private circle; the theatres dared not to produce an exhibition that countenanced the revolution; the Firſt Conſul was repreſented as the chief demon of Pandæmonium; ſongs were compoſed to ridicule the Corſican uſurper; the French citizens were repreſented on the ſtage as a group of aſſaſſins or a band of deſperadoes; caricatures, expreſſive of the moſt degraded and ruinous ſtate of the French government, were expoſed in every picture-ſhop in London. But, as ſoon as peace was proclaimed between the two nations, "the people" exerciſed their *natural benevolence*, and ruſhed forth, like a torrent, to receive with open arms the meſſenger of this joyful intelligence; the city of London reſounded with "long live Bonaparte! long live the French nation!" The horſes were diſmiſſed from the carriage, as being too ſlow in their progreſs, and the people became the promulgators of the glad tidings, by conducting the herald to the metropolis, amidſt the acclamations of thouſands; the city was illuminated; joy was univerſally diffuſed; the citizens congratulated each other with the warmeſt emotion, and there was not a gloomy manſion in the capital, excepting that of *Peter Porcupine*, the paraſite of blood and conflagration. Here is an evidence of *benevolence*, ariſing from the people, which no man can controvert. The deteſtable wretch, who "prays for war," muſt be obliged, from this circumſtance, to deteſt his own villanous imprecation.

From this ſtatement of facts, I muſt aſk the advocates for monarchy or ariſtocracy, what think YE of a government, in which "the people" have no control? Would not the people of England have been at peace long before this period, if they had not been prevented by their arbitrary rulers? Or rather, would they not have been *obliged* to proſecute the war, if the energies of Bonaparte had not arreſted the further exertions of the Engliſh cabinet? Would not the ſwords of Engliſhmen have been ſtill drawn to ſhed the blood of Frenchmen? and inſtead of fraternal embraces being mutually exchanged, would not the violence of reſentment have urged each of them to ſpread the horrors of war in every city and village of the contending parties?

But, thanks to a benign Providence, the ſcene is changed. Inſtead of *conflagrations*, we behold *illuminations*. The SOLDIERS, inſtead of imbruing their hands in each other's blood, are claſping them together in brotherly affection; the SAILORS, inſtead of groaning under the cruelty of *impreſſments*, are rejoicing around the plenteous board of *refreſhments*; the CITIZENS, inſtead of being alarmed at an hoſtile invaſion, are haſtening to the ſhores to welcome the harbinger of public ſecurity. The whole ſcene of peace aſſumes a pleaſing reverſe of war; every freeman's breaſt expands in tranſport at the beatific tranſition.

Thus far the repreſentation of the *benevolence of the people* of *England* is exhibited;—but when we turn our eyes towards FRANCE, the ſcene glows with redoubled fervency. What more tranſporting and dignified ſpectacle can be exhibited than the FETE in Paris, on the termination of war? It is expreſſive of all the benevolent ſenſations of the human heart. Inſtead of a wild, ferocious effuſion of ungovernable paſſions, (inflated by military ſucceſſes) the whole arrangement evinces the moſt perfect ſyſtem of refined reflection; every part of the tranſaction leads to ſocial, moral, and political improvement:—"A temple, dedicated to CONCORD, is erected, in which hymns of peace and ſongs of joy are to be ſung, accompanied with a full band of muſicians, preceded by drums and trumpets. A pantomimic ſpectacle is to be given, in which *all the nations of the earth* are to be armed againſt each other, with a full picture of the calamities of war; on a ſudden, theſe dreadful evils ceaſe, and a ſerene light is ſhed upon the ſcene, while the TEMPLE OF PEACE is exhibited, accompanied

with the pleasing figures of the *fine Arts* and *Commerce*; during this scientific and *dignified* repast, the TEMPLE OF COMMERCE arises, surrounded with a flotilla of boats, elegantly ornamented; on board of which the *seamen of all nations* embark, while the Temple resounds with the flourishes of a full band of music, in all the ecstacy of joy and conviality. Each citizen is to illuminate his mansion; the Thuilleries, bridges and quays are to be ornamented with trophies, expressive of the blessings of peace."

What an exalted and *dignified* lesson of social happiness is inculcated by this festival! Ye revilers of France, hide your heads in the dust, while calumniating a nation which even moralizes in her festive exhibitions. The boisterous huzzas in London may be calculated to express the feelings of Englishmen, but the refinement of France leads to a more exalted object, as connected with the cultivation of the human mind. *Dragging a coach* may gratify the *benevolent effusions* of a well-disposed London populace (depressed by the tyranny of their masters); but the citizens of France rise superior to such degrading servitude. Under the patronage of their government, they exhibit to the world the same *dignified* deportment in the celebration of peace, as they displayed in the prosecution of war. Every movement of the nation gives them an elevated position and respectable attitude; if they were terrific in war, they are instructive in peace. Instead of exciting a vindictive temper against their enemies, or the world, their flotilla is filled with the citizens of *all nations*, and a universal peal of congratulation welcomes them to chaunt in chorus,

"*Bless'd be* the man, *by Heaven design'd*
"*To set the world from slavery free;*
"*In every age, in* every clime,
"His fame *shall live in ecstacy.*"

No. LIV.

CHIEF PRIESTS AND "THE FARMER."

"My Kingdom is not of this World."

SCURRILITY and detraction have so long been the topics in the tory papers that it has become derogatory to the cause of republicanism to notice them, otherwise than by ridicule or satire. It is rather pleasing than mortifying, to observe the paltry efforts of an expiring faction, to recover their lost ground; and their struggles to regain that ascendancy, which had nearly brought our country into a state of ruin, are more diverting than alarming.

If a man was inclined to write a farce, he could not take a subject more appropriate to his purpose, than the ridiculous farrago which is constantly exhibited in the tory gazettes. On one side, we should find a "SULPICIUS" roaring with the utmost vociferation, that the *whole body of clergy* were in danger of annihilation, and for no other reason, than because a writer over the signature of a "FARMER" had declared that *some* among the order had been more *outrageous* than *circumspect* in their political conduct.—Admitting that the Farmer has said this, yet it is a truth which cannot be controverted, and Sulpicius by making an uproar, will not persuade the people that the charge is erroneous. When we read this *clerical advocate*, we cannot but smile at his folly; he represents the priestly order as shaken to its centre—he calls upon the religious of all denominations to rally round *their standard*—he portrays eight hundred of them as falling martyrs in the cause of virtue and morality—we almost anticipate the faggots and fire of extermination, and our imagination is enlivened with the flames ascending towards heaven, while their expiring bodies are engulphed in the horrid conflagration.

To shew the folly of Sulpicius, suppose the writer of a farce should, in the first scene, represent him portending, in a phrenfical

attitude, the ruin and deſtruction of the clergy—ſhould deſcribe on the ſtage, the tortures and perſecutions of this reſpectable claſs of citizens, and cloſe the act, with a deſcriptive ſcene of their agonizing diſſolution. While this was exhibited, there is no doubt the audience would expreſs the higheſt indignation at the cruel tranſaction; but, if in the next act, we ſhould obſerve a large number of thoſe individuals, who are thus exclaiming againſt perſecution (with Sulpicius himſelf in the group) arrayed at the expenſe of their ſocieties, in their gowns and canonicals, claiming *precedency* in the various circles in which they aſſemble, and ſeated around almoſt every feſtive board within their vicinity, partaking of the comforts of life in a ſuperior degree to moſt of their pariſhioners, we ſhould readily turn our deteſtation on the author of the calumny, and laugh at the folly of thoſe who apprehended their annihilation.

We ſhould readily inquire in what inſtance are the clergy perſecuted? Did they ever live in more union with their pariſhioners? Were they ever better clothed and fed than at the preſent day? Is there one man of the clergy, who dreads the indignation of his pariſhioners in conſequence of the remarks of the Farmer, provided he acts conformable to the duties of his office? While he continues in the line of his profeſſion, there is no danger of diſquietude—the people are willing to hear *goſpel truths*, though they may be diſpleaſed with *political hereſy*. If he ſo far violates his ordination-contract by preaching "*the doctrines of men*," inſtead of the precepts of the goſpel, he is no more entitled to pay from his pariſh, than if he totally abandoned his pulpit, and purſued a calling foreign from his engagements. If the pariſhioners pay three dollars a year to a printer for newſpapers, they are unwilling to pay ten dollars a year to a parſon for political diſquiſitions. A printer and a preacher are two diſtinct occupations, and while the people give the former a ſupport in the line of his buſineſs, they are unwilling to double the expenſe to hear a repetition of the ſame ſubjects from the latter. When we read newſpapers, we expect to find political controverſies, and when we read or hear ſermons we expect to find religious diſſertations. When we ſee a ſermon turned into a newſpaper, it is as foreign from our expectations, as to ſee a newſpaper turned into a ſermon; every performance ought to be analagous to the profeſſion of its

author. A printer to become preacher, or a preacher to become printer, is quite out of character. A *printer's devil** with his *smutty paper apron*, in the pulpit, would cut a singular figure, and a clergyman in his *bands*, besmeared with ink and beating the *black balls*, would be nearly as laughable a character.

The FARMER has considered the subject on this rational ground, and he is attacked with the utmost violence for this plain position. But who can contradict the assertion, that the duty of the clergy relates to spirituals, and is totally distinct from temporals. This is the doctrine of our SAVIOUR, who declared, "*My kingdom is not of this world.*" If the clergy are his ambassadors, they ought to be employed about "their Master's business." If "*His kingdom* is not of this world," certainly his vicegerents cannot have a distinct kingdom from HIM, under whose commission they officiate. The whole doctrine of scripture expressly disowns every thing of a temporal nature. Revelation is founded on the declaration of the SUPREME BEING, that the powers of the earth shall not prevail against it. A real Christian increases in his faith, by the opposition made against the fiat of Omnipotence—the disciples and apostles never reprobated Pilate or the *chief priests*, because they were attempting to annihilate the Christan system by their persecution; on the contrary, they exulted at the idea, that every attempt to destroy its benign operation, would give celerity to the propagation. The martyrs at the stake never bewailed the decline of religion by their sacrifice, but, amidst all the torture and ridicule of their enemies, rejoiced in the pleasing hope, that "the gates of hell should not prevail against it."

If this was the faith of the disciples, apostles and martyrs, why does Sulpicius or any of the clergy appear so alarmed at the observations of the Farmer? This writer, so far from wishing to injure the clergy, only enjoins the same doctrines promulgated by our SAVIOUR and his apostles. When Christ was on earth the *chief priests* were the most powerful and vindictive body that opposed his ministry. At that time, these *priests* were interfering in political concerns. They were crying out—"he is not Cæsar's friend." They persecuted him in their ecclesiastical capacity,

* *I beg pardon for the expression; but it is a technical term in the typographical profession.*

becauſe they found he was deſtroying their political authority. Amidſt this general outcry againſt HIM and his adherents, we find no diſtruſt of the extermination of the Chriſtian ſyſtem; but the commiſſion was given, even in this "reign of terror," to go forth and *preach the goſpel* to all nations. Chriſt's kingdom being not of this world, he rather promoted his cauſe by the oppoſition from civil rulers. Religion and civil policy were at variance, and the ſtrength of religion was evidenced by not meddling with civil authority. Is it not ſtrange then, that thoſe of the preſent day, who profeſs to believe in the goſpel, ſhould be ſo conſtantly alarming the people, that religion is to be exterminated? If they believe as they profeſs, theſe men muſt be aſhamed of their conduct. Inſtead of being believers in, they may more properly be ſtyled revilers of, the goſpel. They doubt the authenticity of the declaration, "that the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it." They endeavour to gainſay what our SAVIOUR has expreſsly declared, that "his kingdom is not of this world." Inſtead of preaching politics, let them attend to Chriſtian doctrines, and by that means put to ſilence their opponents.

Religion never gained a proſelyte by a political argument. Propagating tales of illuminati, will never convert a man to the Chriſtian faith; it rather leads him to doubt its authenticity, when he is told that there is danger of its being ſubverted by a combination of renegadoes in Europe and America. If the clergy are alarmed, it naturally makes the people timid, for if the ſoldiers who are *ſpecially commiſſioned* to "fight the good fight of faith," are diſcomfited, how can they expect to gain followers when the cauſe is conſidered deſperate? If the apoſtles had acted as *ſome* of our modern clergy do, they would have ruined in the firſt outſet the whole ſyſtem of revelation. Sulpicius appears more alarmed at the Farmer, than the diſciples were at the anathemas of the whole Jewiſh hierarchy. He has only given *ſome* of them a gentle reproof, and by the ſubtlety of a *few delinquents*, they are attempting to bring into the controverſy the whole order. The diſciples, when commiſſioned to preach the goſpel, were ordered to take neither money nor ſcrip; but Sulpicius is rouſing the clergy under an apprehenſion, that if they cannot *force* the people to pay them, the Chriſtian religion will ſoon be obliterated. This temporal ſupport was but a ſmall conſideration with the primitive

Chriſtians, for St. Paul declares that if they looked for conſolation in this world, "of all men they would be the moſt miſerable."

Far be it from me to leſſen their reputation, or take one cent from their decent maintenance. As a citizen, I wiſh to give them a proper eſtimation in the public mind; but if a few clamorous individuals are endeavouring to raiſe them to an elevation above that which is contemplated by ſcripture, it is proper to conſider this ſubject on the primary principles of the goſpel. Our Saviour was born in a manger: he had not where to lay his head; he was perſecuted, and at laſt crucified in the moſt ignominious manner—his diſciples followed his doctrines and experienced ſimilar indignity. The Chriſtian religion, however, prevailed againſt every oppoſition, and for the encouragement of ſaints, it will prevail till the conſummation of all things. The "filthy lucre" of this world, is no way connected with goſpel truths, and and when we ſee men rouſed to an improper reſentment, on the ſuggeſtion of a decreaſe of pecuniary emoluments, we have reaſon to doubt the ſincerity of their religious profeſſions. Such men are the greateſt enemies to the cauſe of real, unadulterated Chriſtianity. It ſhows they purſue the profeſſion merely for the emoluments ariſing from it, and not for the glory of God.

I acknowledge, however, that ſociety requires every reſpect to the clergy, and I ſhould be ſorry to have them depreciated in public eſtimation. A large proportion of them are worthy the higheſt confidence, and I hope ever to ſee them maintained with a cheerful liberality. But, when we obſerve too great a ſtride taken to impoſe on the public by ſuch writers as Sulpicius, &c. it is neceſſary to place the ſubject on its juſt baſis, and if any *real Chriſtian* contends the principles, he will be heard and anſwered with all that candour, which the importance of the controverſy demands.

To conclude this diſcourſe, I would briefly obſerve, it is my ſincere belief, that the people of this country were never more diſpoſed to pay every reſpect to the clergy, in the *line of their profeſſion*, than at the preſent day; and the only difficulty which has ariſen, is ſolely owing to a *few* of the order, who, from bigotry, pride and oſtentation, have buſied themſelves in thoſe things which do not concern them, and thereby raiſed a jealouſy which is

difficult to remove. If such fanatics would hold their peace, and mind their scriptural studies, instead of revising *Chesterfield*, and exciting false alarms, about combinations, massacres, &c. every difficulty would subside, and general harmony between ministers and people would be speedily restored.

No. LV.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE HON. G. MORRIS'S SPEECH UPON THE REPEAL OF THE JUDICIARY LAW.

WHEN declamation assumes the garb of argument, it is proper to expose the pageantry and exhibit the subject before the public in its proper habiliments. When a Senator *libels* THE PEOPLE, we cannot but smile at the tears he may shed, while bemoaning the annihilation of the Constitution. The people being the source of the Federal Constitution, an attempt to vitiate the principles of its vitality deserves the most pointed reprehension.

While reading Mr. Morris's speech, we cannot but pity the man who sacrifices propriety to sonorous periods, who vilifies that "popular will which brought him into political existence," and who deprecates "public opinion" as the quick-sand on which the Constitution is to be wrecked. He seems to take a stand above all legitimate control, and places himself and the "frail beings" around him, as the only barriers to maintain the dignity, harmony and existence of the American nation.

"THE PEOPLE" are held in the utmost state of degradation, and under this impression, he exclaims with superlative confidence, that, "WE, we the Senate of the United States, are assembled here to save THE PEOPLE from their most *dangerous enemy*; to save them from *themselves*; to guard them against the baneful effects of *their own precipitation, their passions and misguided zeal!*"—A modest declaration truly! Happy, thrice happy Americans! how enviable your situation, that the *Hon. Governeur Morris, Esq.* and his "frail" associates should become the sole guardians of your happiness—on

what a permanent basis are your liberties, lives, and property founded!—With this ANCHOR ye can ride out the tempestuous storm of your passions; ye can trust your treasures to their management, and "throw your compass and charts into the ocean," while the political ship is directed by their superior wisdom.—How sublime the benevolence! that a man should wrest the weapon from the hands of "THE PEOPLE," which is uplifted to commit the fatal act of *suicide*. This virtuous Senator, like the angel of old, arrests the sword just ready to sever every endearing bond which unites the paternal and filial affections of society.—"Do thyself no harm," is the friendly voice of this guardian of our welfare—"pause! pause! for heaven's sake, pause!" is the fervent supplication of this disinterested and magnanimous patriot. Solicitous for our happiness, he proclaims the glad tidings, that "WE, we the Senate of the United States, are assembled here to save the people from themselves"!!!—"WE, we the Senate beseech you to have mercy on your lives, liberty and property;" "'tis for this purpose that WE are chosen; else why are WE elected for six years; or why are WE chosen by *communities* while the Representatives *are chosen directly by the people*." After this pathetic appeal, can "The People" hesitate a moment to surrender every legislative transaction to the Senate? Can they trust to *their Representatives who are only directly chosen by themselves?* Can they be so foolish as to look for protection from men who receive no other commission than the *immediate suffrages* of their fellow-citizens?

The voice thus calling on the people is rendered still more harmonious by a declaration of the strongest attachment to the Constitution. The sage and benevolent Senator, while imploring the people not to commit violence on themselves, declares that he has been "twenty years their *servant*." Although he has been "*a servant*" upwards of two apprenticeships to this outrageous rabble, yet he now begins to vilify and abuse his *masters*. He denounces them as a pack of cut-throats, as committing outrages on *themselves*, and represents his *employers* as insane and dangerous to be trusted. This is an extraordinary story for "a servant" to propagate about his master; after being twenty years in their service, a better report might have been expected. It is rather singular to hear a "*servant*" insult his *master* with such language—common decency

might have warranted a more mild reprehenſion, from one who aſſumes the courtly addreſs of a gentleman.

How the Hon. Governeur Morris ſhould have *more friendſhip* for the people, than they have for *themſelves*, is a political paradox. The Conſtitution, in the preamble, conveys no ſuch idea. It is there declared, "We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, eſtabliſh juſtice," &c.—but, if Mr. Morris is right in his poſition, it ought to have run thus, "We the People, being diſpoſed to injure ourſelves, but having at this moment a ſhort interval of reflection, do conſtitute and appoint the Hon. Governeur Morris and his "frail" aſſociates, the guardians and protectors of our rights, liberty and property; and more eſpecially to defend us *againſt ourſelves*." If this had been the declaration, inſtead of being a *ſervant*, he would have been one of the *lord high protectors* of the people; he would then have had a commiſſion properly authenticated to denounce the citizens; he could then with propriety have ſaid "that he loved the Conſtitution—that he conſidered it the bond of our union—that on it depended our harmony and our peace—that without it we ſhould be plunged into all the horrors of a civil war—that the country would be deluged with the blood of its inhabitants, and a brother's hand would be raiſed againſt the boſom of a brother." To be conſiſtent, he cannot love a Conſtitution which is founded on the will of men whom he conſiders ſo frantic that "WE, we the Senators" are obliged to ſave them from their moſt dangerous enemies, viz. THEMSELVES. Or does he conceive that after they had exhauſted their *wiſdom* in the mighty effort to create *him* a Senator, that they conſequently exhibited their folly in laying a foundation to deſtroy themſelves? The "ſervant" in this caſe becomes ſuperior to his lord. How Mr. Morris acquired more attachment to the intereſt of the people than they have for themſelves, is a ſingular phenomenon. In what inſtance has it appeared? Where is the document which gives him this pre-eminence? On what occaſion was it evinced? Before a man aſſumes this elevated tone, it is neceſſary for him to produce the pledge of his ſupremacy—we doubt his premiſes, and it lies with him to ſubſtantiate his claim.

Beſides, what part of the people does he preſume to dictate? Does he charge the *whole body* as guilty of ſuicide? Are federal and anti-federal all in league to deſtroy themſelves? It ſeems this

is his meaning, for he appears afraid to truſt the Houſe of Repreſentatives even to amend the bill. This *ſenatorial protector* of our rights further declares, that "to *amend* the bill were to deſtroy it;" "that even if it got back to the Houſe of Repreſentatives it would periſh," and he is candid enough to declare that "WE, we the Senate" "took the bill with all its imperfections."

In this ſtate of the buſineſs, Mr. Morris, I am diſpoſed to join you in your caution, of "pauſe! pauſe! for heaven's ſake pauſe!" Let the people who are thus reprobated by you, ſeriouſly demand why you was afraid to truſt the bill to the deliberate deciſion of the Houſe of Repreſentatives. Were not the reſpective branches of the Legiſlature compoſed at that time of a majority of thoſe who are emphatically ſtyled *federaliſts?* Why was you at that time jealous, "if it got back to the Houſe of Repreſentatives it would periſh?" Was it of ſo dangerous a nature, that even the high-toned federaliſts of the "old ſchool" viewed it with an unfriendly eye? Could you not truſt it in their hands, even for "an *amendment*"? Was it of ſuch a delicate texture, that to *amend* was to *deſtroy?* Indeed, *honourable ſir*, your rhapſodies tranſport you beyond your proper latitude—you carry too much ſail for your ballaſt—you "throw the ſhip into the wind" by your ſuperlative auſterity, for while you level your attack on the people, you equally denounce the whole body of federaliſts who compoſed one branch of the Legiſlature; you preſumed to ſave THEM alſo from "*themſelves*."

—To bring this part of your ſpeech to iſſue, I would inquire of the Hon. Governeur Morris, why he was afraid to truſt the Houſe of Repreſentatives with a ſecond conſideration of the ſubject? Were not a large proportion of the members high-toned federaliſts, friends to Mr. Adams, and oppoſed to Mr. Jefferſon? Did they not appear in their *night-caps* and *cockades* to counteract his election? Why then, *honourable ſir*, was you jealous that your favourite project would be defeated amid ſuch a hoſt of federal friends? If they put on their *night-caps* and the ſtill more formidable inſignia of a *cockade*, to oppoſe Mr. Jefferſon, it is probable they would have diſplayed equal fervor in ſupport of the Judiciary ſyſtem. Your declaration therefore, honourable ſir, fully evinces the fallacy of your reaſoning; it proves that even the federaliſts in the Houſe of

Repreſentatives were unfriendly to the meaſure ; that the Judiciary act, if it was now before the ſame men who conſtituted the laſt Houſe of Repreſentatives, would be deſtroyed. In ſhort, " WE, THE PEOPLE," deſire no other evidence of the propriety of the REPEAL than this frank and explicit declaration of the Honourable Governeur Morris.

" Pauſe ! pauſe !" fellow-citizens, " for heaven's ſake pauſe," before you truſt your lives, liberties and property into the hands of men who declare you in a ſtate of inſanity. If the people are not competent to ſecure themſelves, or if they are to look *ſolely* to the Honourable G. Morris and his " frail" aſſociates for protection, the Lord have mercy upon them. If the people would deſtroy themſelves, vain is their hope, if they look to him for reſuſcitation. I am free to declare, I had rather truſt to the people than to him. The Honourable G. Morris may be a wiſe man, a prudent man, an honourable man, and a patriot ; but however wiſe, prudent and honourable he may be, yet I truſt THE PEOPLE will never be in ſuch a delirium as to look to him as the ſole guardian of their conſtitutional rights. WE, "WE THE PEOPLE," are not diſpoſed to commit ſuicide, and WE muſt pauſe before we admit the idea, that the Senate are a body aſſembled to ſave us from our " *moſt dangerous enemy*," to ſave us from OURSELVES.

Other remarks on this Speech will occupy the next Number.

No. LVI.

HONOURABLE GOVERNEUR MORRIS'S SPEECH.

WHEN a man weeps over the Conſtitution, it naturally excites a degree of complacency in the public mind to attend to his lamentations ; but after examining the cauſe of his complaints, and finding it the mere rhapſody of a heated imagination, we cannot but ſmile at the vehemence of his exclamation.

A ſtranger, upon reading Mr. Morris's ſpeech, would naturally ſuppoſe that the fate of America was ſuſpended on the continuance of this judiciary ſyſtem; he would think that upon its repeal, diſcord, anarchy and a ſtate of nature would be the immediate reſult of the deciſion; that government was diſſolved; that the Senate and Houſe of Repreſentatives were annihilated, and that nothing was to be expected but inſurrections and every civil commotion.

This lively deſcription might well be expected from Mr. Morris, who feels ſuch a ſtrong attachment to this particular branch of government; who declares it to be the "fortreſs of the conſtitution"; who, "like honeſt Ajax, would not only throw a ſhield before it, but would build around it a wall of braſs." When a man ſteps forward in ſuch a commanding attitude, with "his ſhield and wall of braſs," we are ready to ſympathize with him, ſhould he fail to effect his magnanimous purpoſe.

But, honourable ſir, let us be cool on this ſubject, let us throw aſide all the parade of rhetoric, and appeal to the reaſon, rather than the paſſions of the people; let *us* "pauſe," before we decide. After this deliberate reflection, I hope even the Honorable *Governeur Morris*, Eſq. will wipe away his tears, ſoothe the emotions of his labouring mind, and ſo far compoſe himſelf as to lay aſide his ſhield and remove his wall of braſs, as uſeleſs and unneceſſary.

Admit, honourable ſir, that the repeal ſhould take place, I would aſk you, what difficulties would enſue? Would the Conſtitution be annihilated by the repeal of a law, which you declared would not have paſſed, had it been returned to the Houſe of Repreſentatives for *amendments?* According to your own ſtatement, it was a crude, undigeſted ſyſtem—it was a child of ſuch diſtorted features, that you was obliged to watch it like a godfather, in its cradle—you was afraid to truſt it out of your hands—you dandled it on your knees, and could not truſt it to walk into another room, leſt it ſhould periſh in its progreſs. Can any man be ſo fooliſh as to think, that a ſyſtem ſo incomplete in its fabrication, ſo weak in its compoſition, and ſo abhorrent even to thoſe who gave it exiſtence, ſhould be the "wall of braſs," to ſecure the freedom, ſovereignty and independence of our country? This wonderful project was matured with precipitation, and organized at a moment, when the agents themſelves were under the ſtrongeſt parox-

iſms of their own diſſolution—this being a fact, how is it poſſible that the welfare, proſperity and happineſs of the United States ſhould be ſuſpended on ſuch a frail, incoherent and undigeſted ſyſtem.

It is diverting to obſerve the pathos of Mr. Morris, when he exclaims, " if we loſe *this charter*, never, never, ſhall we get another." I would inquire, honourable ſir, what charter ? Do you call this Judiciary act a CHARTER, which, if we loſe, we " never, never" can renew ? What mighty boon do we obtain by the adoption ? What valuable acquirements are ſecured to the people by this haſty performance ? Will a numerous body of judges, with all the expenſes attending their appointment, be conſidered " a charter" ſo valuable, that if we loſe it, the loſs will be irreparable ? The citizens, I believe, will never conſider it ſo eſſential to their happineſs, as to bemoan its annihilation ; more eſpecially, when they know, that by repealing this act, we are reſtored to the ſame ſyſtem, under which government proceeded during the adminiſtration of Waſhington. By diſmiſſing your phalanx of judges, we reſtore the old order of things, and if we were able to obtain juſtice under the benign adminiſtration of our firſt Preſident, why do you preſume to predict a diſſolution of the Conſtitution, when we are deſirous of giving the ſame energy to the Judiciary as was experienced under him ?

" Away, away, with all theſe derogatory ſuppoſitions" ; make yourſelf eaſy, honourable ſir. If Waſhington was able to purſue the great purpoſes of government under the former ſyſtem, is it not the higheſt preſumption to ſuppoſe that it will not now anſwer ? Even Mr. Adams had no other Judiciary than what is now propoſed—neither could he need more. Were not the former judges fully competent to enforce the Sedition Law ? Did he find in any one inſtance, that the judges were deficient in executing every federal mandate ? Were not the courts of law prompt in their deciſions to aid every meaſure which bore the feature of executive patronage ? Did Judge Bee want any ſtimulus in the condemnation of Robbins ? The judges under the former adminiſtration were preachers of the glad tidings of preſidential infallibility, in every part of the Union. Produce, ſir, one caſe, wherein the government was embarraſſed from the delinquency of the judges ? If the Judiciary were then adequate to all federal purpoſes, why

are they now deficient? If Mr. Adams could profecute his meafures under the old eftablifhment, why are you to fuppofe that Mr. Jefferfon is not equal to the fame undertaking? Why fhould Mr. Adams on the night of his diffolution, wifh to force on his fucceffor a more extravagant Judiciary than he himfelf had maintained? Was it juft, that Mr. Jefferfon fhould be incumbered with fupernumerary judges, and thereby bring his adminiftration into difrepute, by an additional expenfe? Why fhould the wheels of government be clogged with a new fyftem of judiciary, at the moment Mr. Jefferfon was introduced into office? Why did Mr. Adams fuppofe, that his fucceffor could not profecute the bufinefs of the government with the fame number of judges as were thought competent from the firft eftablifhment of the Conftitution? It muft rather appear officious in Mr. Adams to create a fupernumerary body of judges, at the moment he was leaving his office, and when in all probability the bufinefs was decreafing. It is fomewhat fimilar to a man's placing a number of tenants in a houfe after the expiration of his leafe, and prefuming to give them a *permanent* refidence, without the advice or confent of the real owner.

Mr. Morris exhibits fuch an enthufiaftic frenzy in this debate, that he appears rather like an infatuated preacher, than a deliberate Senator. The epithets are more expreffive of fanaticifm than reflection. In one inftance, he repreferits himfelf in the ftrong mufcular pofition of Ajax, throwing a fhield to defend the Judiciary, and with Herculean vigour building a wall of brafs around it: but after all his exertion in wielding his fhield and building his wall, he declares, "he is *too weak* to defend the ramparts againft the hoft of aflailants." He however feems determined to purfue his enterprize, for if he fails in military ardour, or cannot embody men enough for perfonal conflict, he propofes to mount the ramparts, and with the utmoft vociferation call to "his aflifiance the good fenfe, virtue and patriotifm of his opponents." The honourable gentleman muft have a fad task to perform in this fituation—his fhield thrown away, the ramparts of his brafs wall totally defenceleis, while this modern Ajax is mounted on the moft prominent eminence, and like Patience on a monument, calling aloud to his aflailants, "pauie! pauie! for heaven's fake pauie!"—This is truly an unequal conteft, and though we may think it a Quixotic

controverſy, yet we cannot but applaud the heroiſm of the adventurer, even if we ſuppoſe the meaſure to be raſh and precipitate.

The Hon. Mr. Morris appears however to bewail the conſtitutionality of the proceeding—on this part of the ſubject I ſhall offer a few remarks. It muſt be remembered that the Conſtitution is a *covenant of works;* every officer under it is aſſigned ſpecial duties and ſervices. Officers are not contemplated unleſs ſervices are attached to them. Neither the legiſlative nor the executive can wantonly create offices, unleſs there are ſpecial duties to be performed. The pay goes with the *ſervices*, and if none is to be done, there is no pay ſtipulated.

To apply this reaſoning to the new Judiciary ſyſtem. If the laſt adminiſtration in order to effect certain purpoſes took upon themſelves to annihilate the old order of things, and in a precipitate manner created a new ſyſtem, with a number of ſupernumerary judges, totally unneceſſary for the circumſtances of the country, can it be doubted, whether it is in the power of the preſent adminiſtration to rectify the meaſure? The only queſtion is, whether the former Judiciary ſyſtem was competent to the purpoſes as it related to the number of judges; if it was, has the executive or legiſlative a conſtitutional authority to burden the people with an unneceſſary expenſe, or can it be conſidered unconſtitutional to repeal an act, or refuſe payment to judges, when no adequate reaſon can be offered for the extenſion of the ſyſtem? It is readily granted that a Judiciary ſhall be eſtabliſhed; this was done at the earlieſt period of the conſtitution. The queſtion then is, whether there can be no *limitation* in this eſtabliſhment? Whether a legiſlature juſt expiring, and a Preſident juſt going out of office, ſhall combine to make twenty judges, when five are fully ſufficient for all the exigences of our government? Whether it can be unconſtitutional to relieve the people from unneceſſary taxes, when it is apparent that the eſtabliſhment was rather a ſinecure to the judges. Though the Conſtitution ſays, that, "the judges ſhall hold their offices during good behaviour," yet it alſo ſays, that they ſhall receive for their "*ſervices* a compenſation." The Conſtitution contemplates *ſervices*; and if none is performed, it is out of the power of the legiſlative to grant them any pay. The Conſtitution meets

the oppoſers more forcibly in granting compenſation to judges whoſe "*ſervices*" are not required, than in the annihilation of the office. It being a *covenant of works*, the duties of the officers are eſſentially connected with their ſalaries. It would be a violation of the Conſtitution to grant compenſation to a mere *nominal judge*, when it is expreſsly declared, that he muſt perform "*ſervices*" before he is entitled to his pecuniary conſideration.

Upon the whole, the honourable gentleman has miſtaken the *ſpirit* and even the letter of the Conſtitution, when he enforces the unconſtitutionality of *not paying* the judges; for nothing is more plain than that "ſervices" muſt be performed, before one penny can be drawn from the public treaſury. If ſo, I would inquire what *ſervices* the preſent judges have *done*, and if in the opinion of the legiſlature there are none for them *to do*, whether by the *ſpirit of the Conſtitution* they are entitled to any compenſation? This appears clear reaſoning, for if the legiſlature can grant pay to a a body of *nominal judges* when their duties are not required, or, if it is out of their power to modify the courts ſo as to retrench, if neceſſary, the number of judges, it is nothing more than an indirect method to create within the United States a formidable phalanx of penſioners in direct oppoſition to every rational and economical principle of the conſtitution. The organization of the Judiciary being inveſted in Congreſs, it follows that the ſyſtem muſt ever be within their cognizance. Infallibility cannot be ſuppoſed more attached to the legiſlature in this inſtance, than in many others which are ſubject to reviſal. The conſtitutionality of the repeal therefore is evident by the abſurdity of their being bound to adhere to a ſyſtem, inexpedient from our ſituation, adopted without mature conſideration, in oppoſition to the will of the Houſe of Repreſentatives at the time of paſſing the act, and from whence no eſſential "*ſervices*" can be rendered to the United States.

No. LVII.

TO HARRISON G. OTIS, ESQ.

A PUBLIC avowal of political principles is a ſtrong proof of the integrity of a man's conduct. As you, ſir, often retail political ſentiments in a caucus, and vaunt in your adroitneſs in ſtimulating a party, on the evening immediately preceding an election, it cannot be thought improper to compliment ſuch an orator, by requeſting a copy of his ſpeech for the preſs.

As you, ſir, have ſuch ſerious objections to the adminiſtration of the federal government, it is a pity that ſuch cogent reaſons ſhould not have a more extenſive circulation than within the ſmall circle of a few devoted friends; or that Vila's tavern ſhould be the only theatre on which to diſplay the magnitude of your patriotiſm and the immenſity of your political talents.

On Friday evening laſt, a numerous body of citizens aſſembled at Faneuil-Hall, to ſelect proper candidates for Governour, Lieutenant-Governour and Senators. The republicans were called on; the friends to UNION were invited. If, ſir, you had any thing to allege againſt the preſent adminiſtration, it was incumbent on you to meet your oppoſers on equal ground; if you had attended, you would have heard a requeſt to men of your ſentiments, in the preſence of two thouſand citizens, to offer their obſervations. But ſo far from any perſon on your ſide of the queſtion confronting their opponents, they declined the controverſy.

If, ſir, you was ſincere in your remarks on ſabbath evening, at Vila's, why did you not appear on Friday evening at Faneuil-Hall? Why did you chooſe to confine your obſervations within ſo ſmall a compaſs, when you had an opportunity to give them a more extenſive circulation? If the preſent adminiſtration has a tendency to produce the evils you ſuggeſted, it was your duty, (as an honeſt man) to give publicity to your apprehenſions. If the northern ſtates are to be injured by Mr. Jefferſon, proclaim

the reasons of your belief in such a manner, and in such assemblies, as may lead to an impartial investigation of this interesting subject. Do not vilify a government without giving an opportunity of replying to your charges.

The design of your speech seems calculated to raise a jealousy between the northern and southern states; to destroy the confidence of the people in the friendly disposition of the present administration; and to inflame the public to such a pitch as to dissolve the union. If such were your intentions, let me ask whether you have weighed in your mind the consequences of such measures, as they relate to the various interests of the merchant, tradesmen, and the holders of the public funds?

The merchant must eventually be injured by such a separation —the tradesman would immediately feel the distressing effects of this mercantile embarrassment—and the holders of the funds would experience a shock which would shake their quarterly payment to the center.

If the northern and southern states should separate, a *new constitution* must be adopted by the New-England states. The high-wrought principles of the Essex junto would be universally exploded, and though some might think to impose on the northern states a constitution analogous to the British, yet a convention of delegates, acting under the instructions of their constituents, would baffle their expectations. During the important period of adopting a new constitution, the public debt would be suspended between the contending parties, and the creditors would be hawking their 6 and 8 per cents. about our streets (like the old soldiers) at 2/6 in the pound.

These remarks are not visionary, but are too serious to be sported with. Who then will thank the man that has agitated a subject so uncertain in its consequences? Will he be considered as a friend to the general interest who attempts to rend asunder the bands of UNION, set afloat every species of property, and thereby *force* the public creditors to seek an asylum amid the contending parties? These are questions of importance, and ought at least to check the sallies of disappointed ambition, lest the evils should thicken too rapidly to be easily dissipated.

In order, sir, to bring this subject to a fair investigation, and to try your arguments by a touchstone more pungent than the effusions of Vila's hall, you are again requested to publish your philippic against the federal government, delivered on sabbath evening, and I pledge myself to answer it, with a signature equally as explicit as the one you subscribe.

No. LVIII.

TO HARRISON G. OTIS, ESQ.

THE Boston Gazette of the 5th instant, contains a few sketches of your speech delivered at Vila's on the sabbath evening preceding the election for Governour. It is declared, "that you have always acquitted yourself handsomely, but never did better than on this occasion." We have then, sir, before us, one of your *best speeches*, and though the reporter apologizes for his inability to do you justice, yet he cannot forbear gratifying those who could not be indulged the pleasure of seeing and hearing you acquit yourself so "*handsomely*."

The speech abounds with such an energy of pathos, that it excites a glow of fervency in the first outset. We cannot but admire the brilliant sentiment in describing Vila's hall as a *camp*, in which was collected the main body of the federal army. Bonaparte could not address his veterans in a style more heroic than you did the *moderator*, viz. "Hard indeed, sir, is the fate of a garrison, when the troops are not only obliged to *sleep* upon their arms, but find it necessary to make frequent sallies to prevent a *surprize*." If your troops were disposed to meet their opponents, why do you complain of a "surprize," when on the Friday evening previous to your *muster*, the republicans gave public notice that they were to assemble at Faneuil-Hall? Certainly, sir, there was no danger of a "surprize," when you had notice in the public papers three days before your meeting. Why did you not then sally to the Hall, and like a *bold general*, bring your men into the

field of battle ? Why, on that evening, did you ſuffer the garriſon "to *ſleep* on their arms," or why did you chooſe to deſert the ample ſpace of Faneuil-Hall, and croud your *main body* on a *ſabbath evening* within the ſmall compaſs of Vila's hall ? Is it generous, ſir, to complain of a "ſurprize," when the moſt public information was given of the *time* and *place* of meeting ? If your troops have long "ſlept on their arms," why did you not rouſe them from their *ſlumbers*, and march them in ſolid columns to confront their opponents ? I ſuſpect, ſir, the difficulty in your garriſon aroſe principally from the want of *ammunition*, and that you thought a few vollies of muſketry, when the republican army was diſperſed, would have a better effect than a general engagement.

Your ſpeech, ſir, further deſcribes, in pathetic language, "the inconveniences which the aged and *ſober* citizens ſuſtained on an election-day, by the noiſe and confuſion of the *jacobin bawlers*, on Faneuil-Hall ſtairs." Why is this charge againſt the *jacobins* (or in other words the republicans) when your own caucus appointed a committee of one hundred and twenty men to diſtribute votes on this occaſion ? If you look over the names you will find among the number, ſome of the moſt noiſy, boiſterous men that can be produced in the town. This committee arranged themſelves in ſimilar order, in conducting the election, as the firewards make lanes to communicate water to the engines. The whole force of the federal party took poſſeſſion of almoſt every avenue, and every voter had to paſs an ordeal, under the minute inſpection of bank directors, Eſſex junto men, and ſycophants hanging on their patronage. How then, ſir, can you preſume to talk about "jacobin bawlers," when the caucus, in which you aſſumed the direction, appointed ſuch a numerous committee, as almoſt drowned by their vociferation every articulation of the republicans ? Why then, ſir, do you talk about the "*engines* of reaſon," to extinguiſh the "*furnace* of your opponents," when you yourſelf blew the bellows of oppoſition, and voted for one hundred and twenty men from Vila's, to influence the election ?

Your reflections on the choice of Mr. Jefferſon are unworthy notice. I do not, ſir, cloſe with you on this ground, by admitting that your objections are valid ; but if you perſiſt in your caucus declamations, I am willing to meet you on this queſtion, whenever your warm zeal ſhall lead you publicly to ſupport your objections.

The foregoing obſervations are ſolely confined to the rhodomontade of your ſpeech, as it relates to the ſublime fiction of an army aſſembled in Vila's hall, the "jacobin bawlers" on Faneuil-hall ſtairs, and the indecency of your aſſertions as to the election of Mr. Jefferſon. I ſhall now advert to your ridiculous pathos, on the meaſures of the preſent adminiſtration. From a "garriſon," Vila's hall is ſuddenly changed to a boiſterous ocean—the wreck of the conſtitution is deſcribed as floating on every billow, "our judiciary on one wave, our internal taxes on another, and our late ſtanding army on another." You further ſay, that "not only the doors but the windows of the temple of juſtice have been burſt open, and the building is filled with a banditti; the pillars of the temple are broken down, its roof has fallen in, and its foundation is undermined." What a deluge of ideas croud upon the mind amid ſuch an inundation of rhapſody. In a hot room, thronged with a body of heated federaliſts, how muſt ſuch glowing ſentiments operate among them? Waves and billows engulphing the conſtitution—internal taxes bobbing up and down like drowning kittens—the ſtanding army, like wharf-rats in a high tide, quitting their encampment—the judiciary! the judiciary, though repreſented by you as a *temple*, is nevertheleſs deſcribed as floating on a wave; the windows broken, the doors burſt open, and a banditti thronging the building. If, ſir, the old adminiſtration have launched ſuch a *ſolid temple* on the ocean, and filled it, like the *Trojan horſe*, with a banditti, it is rather miraculous to find it floating on a wave! I ſhould ſuppoſe it would ſink to the bottom, and that "its foundation" would not eaſily be "undermined."

I am ſenſible, ſir, that it is neceſſary here to notice an apology which appeared in the Palladium; but in juſtice to your friend who reported your ſpeech in the Gazette, I cannot think it poſſible for him to be guilty of ſuch an error. Is is probable, that ſuch a groſs miſtake ſhould ariſe from a man who pretended to give a ſketch of the *beſt ſpeech you ever delivered*; that the "right of ſuffrage" ſhould be miſtaken for the *judiciary ſyſtem*;—that he ſhould abſurdly deſcribe the "doors, windows, benches," &c. of the "*right of ſuffrage.*" No man in his ſenſes could make ſuch a blunder, and yet the editors of the Gazette endeavour to palm, through the Palladium, ſuch abſurdities on the public. They

took care not to expose their folly in their own paper, and therefore made the Palladium a "cat's paw" for the purpose.

In this controversy, sir, nothing more is required than the truth; if your friends have not done you justice, assume the right to yourself; let us have the *whole speech*. If the waves of faction are swallowing up the constitution—if the pieces are tossed about on every billow—if the temple of justice is filled with a banditti, and their *honours* are exposed to *catch cold*, by the windows being broken, and every door burst in, let us have the dreadful disasters described in plain language, and it is not doubted but every republican will lend a hand to repair the damage.

It is equally as *mortifying* to me particularly to address *you* on this subject, as it may be *condescending* in you to reply to my observations; but the crisis of political controversy is such, that it is proper to bring individuals, who volunteer themselves in opposition to the present administration, to explain the motives of their conduct. The object of my address is to prevent an improper bias at the moment of an election, and if possible to bring the leaders of the federal party to an explicit avowal of their sentiments, before the tribunal of the public. The republicans are willing to submit their cause to an impartial investigation, and as you, sir, have presumed to take the lead in opposition to them, your silence will be considered as an evidence of the imbecility of the cause you espouse.

No. LIX.

ON THE MEASURES OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION.

What evil have they done?

THE political controversy in this country is unparalleled in the history of the world; a government assailed by the intrigues of a faction who have no other pretence for their conduct, than the attempts of the administration to lessen the taxes of the people, is a singular phenomenon in society. This peculiar mode of creating animosity among the citizens, is reserved for a wonderful event

of the preſent day ; it is a political paradox, and muſt excite the admiration of Europe, as a circumſtance of a peculiar nature.

The calumny daily beſtowed upon the executive and a majority of the legiſlature, naturally calls upon the citizens to inquire, *What evil have they done ?* Why are ſuch conſtant alarms excited ? Why are the papers ſo fraught with abuſe and detraction againſt every man who appears deſirous to ſupport the preſent government ? Why is a party calling on the people to raliy ? Why are they urging a ſeparation of the ſtates, and endeavouring by every means to deſtroy our *confidence* in the *executive ?*

What evil have they done ? is a queſtion which ſtill recurs. Where is the man who is injured by the meaſures of government ? Is the *merchant*, *tradeſman* or *farmer* injured by the *decreaſe of taxes ?* Even the *ſtock-holder* has no reaſon to complain, as his quarterly demands are as punctually diſcharged as when the government *borrowed money at* 8 *per cent.*

Is it poſſible then, that there can be a ſerious diſpoſition in the people, to oppoſe the preſent adminiſtration ? If no man is injured, who is to begin the oppoſition ? If no citizen is aggrieved, who is to riſe in arms, and under what ſtandard are we to rally ? An army in the field, with all their military apparatus, in oppoſition to a government which is *relieving them from taxes*, muſt be as ridiculous as the vagaries of Don Quixote. It is poſſible, however, that ſome *knight-errant* may contemplate ſuch a whimſical cruſade, and ſome Sancho Panza ſtand ready to attend him in his enterprize ; but the good ſenſe of the people muſt ever hold ſuch wild extravagances in the utmoſt deteſtation.

Preſident Jefferſon, ſince his inauguration into office, has by a ſyſtem of *economy*, ſaved the United States upwards of *three millions of dollars ;* and yet, ſtrange to relate, has been abuſed in the moſt outrageous manner, for the very meaſures which effected it ! Inſtead of which, had he made an addition of this ſum to the expenſes of the laſt adminiſtration, his preſent calumniators would have been his warmeſt advocates ; for it muſt be remembered, that his opponents are of the "ſect," who hold the doctrine that "*a public debt is a public bleſſing ;*" conſequently, every dollar expended is a pledge of that *bleſſing*, and every ſhilling ſaved is the foreboding of a *national curſe.* If the Preſident, inſtead of repealing our internal taxes, had augmented them—inſtead of diſcharg-

ing a numerous body of uſeleſs officers, had increaſed them—inſtead of paying the ſtockholders with the duties ariſing from impoſt only, had requeſted a loan of millions, at 8 or 10 per cent. intereſt: If he had done theſe things, the federal papers would have been crouded with congratulations on our national proſperity; addreſſes would have covered the preſidential table, and in all probability we ſhould have been called on to revive the *cockade*, as the emblem of our attachment to his adminiſtration.

But, alas, it happens unfortunately for this claſs of gentry, that Mr. Jefferſon explodes the ſentiment that "a public debt is a public bleſſing"; he does not wiſh to place the happineſs of his country on this foundation; this "*modern philoſophy*" he diſowns; he ſtudies the general welfare of his fellow-citizens; and is not deſirous to heap bleſſings on one claſs of men, by *curſing every other with taxes*.

This, fellow-citizens, is the *evil which he hath done*—he has leſſened the burden from the ſhoulders of his conſtituents, and has pledged himſelf that he will purſue this line of conduct to the extinguiſhment of the public debt. Theſe are his crimes, and theſe are the ſins of the preſent adminiſtration—if any man is *injured* let him ſpeak.

Here, methinks, I hear a number of men exclaim, *he has turned us out of office*. Alas, gentlemen, your caſes may be deplorable as to your particular private intereſt; but you muſt conſole yourſelves, that the Preſident is not to act by *partial*, but by *general* laws. If you have had the good fortune for many years to live by your offices, it does not follow, that you ſhould continue in them, if the exigencies of the country do not require it. It may be a very "*pretty thing*" for you, to receive an annual compenſation ariſing from the public taxes, but it would be a grievous thing to thoſe who *pay them*, if your ſervices are no longer needed. If you enjoyed theſe bleſſings for a number of years paſt, you ought rather to congratulate yourſelves that you have been ſo far benefitted, than to cenſure and condemn the government for not continuing you in office. The citizens are *grateful*, but not *prodigal*—we *thank you* for all the good you have done ſince your appointments, but you muſt excuſe us, if we are willing that the *pay* ſhould ſtop, when your labours are wholly uſeleſs.—Though ſome of you are diſplaced, and others take your births, yet modeſty ſhould forbid you to exclaim againſt the Preſident; for if he was ſtrictly to

"lay juſtice to the line and righteouſneſs to the plummet" he would extend his removals to a much greater length; for why ſhould thoſe, oppoſed to his adminiſtration, enjoy his particular patronage?

The ſcurrility againſt the Preſident is ſo groſs, and the cauſes of complaint are ſo abſurd, that I conceive it neceſſary to apologize for ſeriouſly noticing them. The federal party appear determined to place the United States in the moſt derogatory point of view in the eyes of the European nations. While other powers are laying exorbitant taxes on their ſubjects—while England is burdening the people at the riſk of an inſurrection, the Eſſex junto are endeavouring to raiſe a rebellion in America for *leſſening taxes*. What can be the deſign of this meaſure? The reaſon is obvious, they wiſh to convince the world, that "THE PEOPLE" are never ſatisfied; that there is as much oppoſition in the *republic* of America, for *decreaſing taxes*, as there is in the *monarchy* of Europe for *increaſing* them. This faction are endeavouring to confound all governments; to riot on the earnings of the induſtrious, and if any complaint ſhould ariſe to bring America as the voucher to prove, that *The People* are never eaſy. Their plans are deep and ſubtle; they are rallying to overthrow the liberties of mankind, and every ſtratagem is uſed to effect their diabolical purpoſes. They wiſh to prove, that the "*people are their greateſt enemies.*"

To prove my poſition, I would remark, that there is no more oppoſition to the Britiſh miniſtry for *augmenting taxes*, than there is in America for *leſſening them*; the Engliſh papers are not more ſevere againſt the Britiſh government, under the preſſure of taxes, than the federal papers againſt the American government for the extinguiſhment of them. Would it not then be a ſtrange ſtory in hiſtory, if the people of England ſhould riſe in arms to obtain an *decreaſe of taxes*, and the citizens of America ſhould at the ſame time rally to *increaſe them?* It would be a curious chapter of accidents, for a recruiting ſergeant in the city of London, to beat up for volunteers to ſeek a *relief from taxes*—while in Boſton, one ſhould, with equal ardour, hold out the tempting inducement of an *additional weight*. This is a paradox; but the "modern philoſophy" that "*a national debt is a national bleſſing*," is the only hypotheſis on which ſuch an abſurdity can be ſubſtantiated in this country.

The Eſſex faction are not contented to lay heavy taxes upon us, but they are anxious for a *diviſion* of the Northern and Southern States. If this ſhould take place, what would be *our* ſituation? The ſhipping of the Northern States muſt lay at the wharves, and Britiſh veſſels would enjoy the excluſive privilege of the *Carrying-Trade;* our ſhip-carpenters would ſpeedily be obliged to lay by their tools; and every tradeſman in town, connected with navigation, muſt retire into the country, or become an underling in the ſtore of a Britiſh agent; our *young men* would be cut off from every commercial enterprize, and have the mortification of ſeeing Britiſh ſhips unloading Britiſh manufactures in the Northern States, and from thence ſent to the Southward for a freight of tobacco and other valuable produce.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, look around us, and inquire, *whether an enemy is not doing this?* Who are the men that are urging a ſeparation, and cenſuring the preſent adminiſtration? Tell me, whether among the whole number, there is an old tory who is not concerned in this buſineſs? They pretend to call it *federaliſm*, but the truth is, it is TORYISM *in diſguiſe;* it is the poiſon of the *old leaven*, which threatened to "leaven the whole lump," during our revolution. The enemies of that day, uſed every effort to make us jealous of our patriots; Hancock and Adams were then abuſed ſimilar to Mr. Jefferſon—our Congreſs were ſtigmatized as a banditti—the temple of juſtice was then deſcribed as having "every window broke and every door burſt in"—the "friends to order" were then called on to rouſe from their ſlumbers, and on the night of the 19th April, 1775, (when the unſuſpecting citizens had retired to reſt) they ſallied out on the defenceleſs yeomanry, and ere the ſun had riſen to its meridian, embrued their hands in the blood of our ſlaughtered countrymen. At that time they endeavoured to divide the Northern and Southern States—but "UNITE OR DIE" was then our motto, and it is now as ſtrong a pledge of our ſafety, under the guidance of heaven, as the ark, amidſt the deluge of the old world. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, be collected, be firm, and perſevering—rely on the goodneſs of your cauſe and the rectitude of your conduct—depend on it, heaven will never ſuffer us to fall a prey to our enemies, after

so many miracles wrought in our favour, during the distressing period of our revolution.

No. LX.

ARTS AND DELUSIONS.

A Demand! a Demand!

IT must be acknowledged that the *junto* have one valuable trait in their political character, viz. *to make the most of every event which arises in their favour.* In this particular, they adopt the peculiar policy of the British ministry, during their controversy with France; every success obtained by the English (however insignificant) was detailed in the government gazettes, as victories of the highest magnitude; the people were led to believe, that every measure of the nation was fraught with the most happy consequences, by partial statements of the defeats and disasters of their enemies. The tower-guns were often fired to announce victories of the most brilliant nature, when the cabinet at St. James's were in possession of documents of a very different complexion. The spirit and enterprize of the nation were essential to the great object of their contention; it has always been the invariable system of the English, to make the most formidable appearance, when their affairs were in the most desperate situation.

During the American war, this conduct was pursued with alacrity; the English papers were constantly filled with anticipations of a complete conquest of the colonies, and the capture of Burgoyne was precursor'd with the vanquishment of the American army; Bunker-Hill battle was celebrated as the most glorious display of British heroism, and the possession of that eminence was described as commanding the most extensive fortresses of America.

During the French revolution, how often have we heard of the total disaffection of the French army? Bonaparte has suffered as many deaths, as Mary Magdalene had devils; he has been

assassinated, eaten, famished, drowned, frozen, poisoned, blown up, and burnt in his camp; the Mamelukes and crocodiles of Egypt have alternately triumphed over his carcase; and the *unfortunate* Bonaparte has sometimes been buried in the sands, and at other times devoured by wild beasts and birds of prey, for the amusement of ministerial hirelings, and to deceive and gull the people.

Thus have the British pursued a system of delusion, and have by these means urged the nation to prosecute their chimerical projects, till even falsehood had lost its energies.

The Essex junto in this country have adopted measures, similar in almost all instances with those of their adherents in Europe; every stratagem has been practised, every mode of deception has been prosecuted; plots and conspiracies were daily announced, as "*clues*" to more disastrous discoveries. As fast as one falsehood was discovered, another was immediately circulated; our elections were ever attended with fresh details of alarming apprehensions, and the people have at these periods, been excited to exercise their suffrages under impressions, that a "tub-plot" was about to blow up the continent, or that a body of Illuminati were undermining every church in the Union: *some of the clergy* seemed to apprehend that a Guy Faux was secreted in every avenue leading to the places of public worship. These idle tales at length began to grow too stale for belief, and their effects were lost among the body of enlightened citizens. True, however, to their designs, the junto persisted in their plans to rouse the fears of the citizens; having exhausted their ingenuity to create new stories of "Ocean massacres," &c. they at length rallied their whole force, and concentrated all their efforts in the cry of a "*French demand!*" This was their *ne plus ultra;* this was their master-piece of policy; here they supposed they had touched the manly spirit of the Americans; *a demand! a demand!* was echoed and re-echoed through the Union—*a demand! a demand!* was proclaimed in every city, town and village within the northern states—*a demand! a demand!* flew like electricity throughout Massachusetts; and on the day of election, though the tremor had somewhat subsided within the circle of information, yet the agitation of the public mind had not totally evaporated; like a shock of an earthquake, it left an undulating motion, which gave an opportunity to the projectors of

the report, to effect in an extensive degree, the pernicious purposes contemplated. Since these disturbers of our peace have been detected in this diabolical scheme, they have given it a more favourable appellation; they have modestly called it a "*loan*," which wears quite a different aspect than what they endeavoured to impress on the public mind by "*a demand, with twelve sail of the line to enforce it!*"

This story, however, turned out a falsehood in every particular, as the French, so far from *demanding a loan*, (with a threat of twelve sail to carry it into execution) have not even *requested* a cent from our government. Thus falls to the ground the "*mammoth*" plot of a "*French demand.*" Baffled in every circumstance on this subject, they are obliged to cover their deformities, by saying that "they *intended* to request a loan." This, however, is a miserable apology for the hue and cry of a "*demand*," and the terrors of twelve sail of the line to enforce it. If they *intended* to make this request, happy are we that the *prowess* of the man, who "prayed for war," has *intimidated* them from their requisition.

The Essex junto, after being defeated in all their designs, have at length resumed courage by the election in Boston. They now run about the streets in frantic ecstacies, assemble on the Exchange with a majestic deportment, and collect at corners in an hostile attitude, for the purpose of vociferating with Stentorian lungs, that *federalism* is gaining an ascendancy in the respective States; as an evidence of which, their first declaration announced that Colonel Thomas was not chosen in New-York; but in two days the Editor of the Centinel was obliged to contradict the falsehood in his own paper, by informing the good people that this same Colonel Thomas obtained upwards of nine hundred votes majority. In this effort they were soon frustrated, and there remains but one solitary resort, viz. *the election in the metropolis.*

But the fallacy of this expectation will soon be realized. The idea that the people of Boston have changed their political sentiments, is also fallacious; the votes, either as it respects Governour, Senators or Representatives, are no test of federal principles, as the confusion and disorder which arose on the first election by the throng passing to the boxes, gave an oppor-

tunity for those who were disposed to violate the equal suffrages of the citizens, to put their plans into execution. The tumult was so outrageous, that it was *out of the power of the selectmen* to prevent an improper crouding upon them, and it is publicly asserted by a respectable tradesman, that he saw three men put a handful of votes into the box, during the general scramble. The last election was more orderly prosecuted, the selectmen have ever shewn a disposition to accommodate the citizens, but the difficulty which attends voting, and the time which it takes to be regularly checked, prevented a large proportion of the republican tradesmen from coming forward on the election of Representatives. The choice, therefore, in this town is more owing to *accident* than any *real change* of political sentiment among the inhabitants. If any specific question was brought before the town, relating to the present administration, there is no doubt the junto would be left in the minority. They are always fearful of a public investigation of Mr. Jefferson's conduct, and choose to confine their caucusses within a small room, rather than to appear in the ample space of Faneuil-Hall.

Notwithstanding all these evidences of the problematical state of the town, yet now, forsooth, the Representatives of Boston are going to raise the "setting sun of federalism." The cry is, we have this *great man*, and that *great man* in the Legislature; and that the seat last year was not *honourably* filled, we had no talents, no honesty, and that one hundred thousand dollars tax was laid on the town by the inefficacy of the members; but this year we shall have *honourable men*, all *honourable* men, gentlemen of veracity; and above all, we are to be *honoured* with a SPEAKER from Boston. Thus every thing is planned with the utmost accuracy for the adoption of the Legislature. Now federalism is reviving, and the country members are under a forcible direction from the "head-quarters of good principles;" if there are any opposers it is probable they will be called a "contemptible minority"; the "*honourable men*" will set their faces against them, and like Joshua of old will arrest the *setting sun* of federalism.

Here I would pause and inquire what is the real meaning of *federalism*, in opposition to the administration of Mr. Jefferson? Does federalism consist in an extravagant expenditure of public money? a standing army? an 8 per cent. loan? a continuance of

internal taxes, whereby Maſſachuſetts paid eighty thouſand dollars, and Virginia only forty thouſand dollars? a ſupernumerary body of officers to create preſidential patronage, and whoſe pay exhauſted a large proportion of the income? Is it federaliſm to calumniate the Preſident, abuſe every officer of government, vilify the majority of Congreſs, raiſe the reſentment of the French, and court the ſmiles of the Engliſh? to encourage thouſands of Britiſh reſidents to monopolize the trade with England, and to ſtarve our *young* American citizens, to feed thoſe who ſcarcely pay a ſhilling tax, while they are vending the ſame articles imported by our own merchants? If this is federaliſm, it is impoſſible that it ſhould long proſper—the YOUNG MEN will quickly feel the effects of this policy. If this is federaliſm—if this is the "riſing ſun" which is vauntingly proclaimed as diffuſing its benign efficacy, depend on it, my young friends, that its genial warmth will never promote your happineſs; it will baffle your hopes; your enterprize will be fruſtrated; the cultivation of the ſoil will not extend your growth; the harveſt will redound to Britons, while you will be left in the field of commerce, like vegetables blaſted by an untimely froſt.

No. LXI.

TO THE "YOUNG MAN," IN THE PALLADIUM.

I HAVE READ your performance with conſiderable attention, and am ſorry you have diſcovered ſo great a degree of acrimony in your obſervations.—Truth is of ſuch a delicate texture, that it muſt be ſought for in the calm receſſes of reflection, rather than in the turbulent effuſions of the paſſions. The ornament of a young man is *modeſty*, and when he overleaps the boundary of decency, he expoſes himſelf more to pity than reſpectful attention. If you have any objections to my remarks, it would be more becoming to point out the impropriety of them, than to retort in a language which conveys an idea that your *manners* have not been improved by your *education*; preſuming, however, that you have ven-

tured in public in order to obtain information, and being unwilling to disappoint you in your laudable design, I shall wave, for the present, my own reflections, *on the baneful tendency of British factors enjoying the same commercial benefits with our own citizens*, and recommend to your candid perusal the circular letter, written by some of our most respectable mercantile characters in the year 1785.

This letter has often been published, but as it contains facts of the most interesting nature; as it expresses the sentiments of men who are well acquainted with our commercial relations; as the measures recommended were the basis on which our federal government was founded; as the debates in the several state conventions (during its adoption) principally contemplated the necessity of some "checks and balances," on the European trade: For these reasons, I presume it will not be thought improper at this time to recommend this important document to your consideration, or even to recommend its being read annually in our town-meetings. It is so particularly descriptive of the present state of our country, I flatter myself, while it communicates *to you* that knowledge of which you appear at present so destitute, it will serve to revive those sentiments among the citizens at large which actuated the merchants of Boston at that eventful period.

However, "*young man*," if the letter should fail to convince *you* of your error, I shall only request that your resentment will hereafter be levelled on the gentlemen who disseminated these principles by a circular letter, (even if some of them have apostatized) rather than on one who is only a proselyte to the truths which it contains.

When you arrive at the age of maturity, you will know the difference between those industrious emigrants, who arrive in America for the purpose of improving our manufactures, cultivating the soil, and whose object is a *permanent residence*, and the mere transient hawkers who only reside in the commercial towns, for the sole purpose of vending their goods, to the injury of our merchants, who pay little or no taxes, whose residence is so temporary, that they are not afraid to hazard their reputation by erroneous entries in the custom-house, and who will in time destroy all the regular importation of our own citizens.

If the *young men* of the present day are more enlightened and liberal than the merchants whose signatures accompany the Ad-

dreſs, or if they are perſuaded they can riſe ſuperior to all the conſequences anticipated by thoſe gentlemen, yet I am perſuaded there is ſo much candor reſiding in the breaſts of the youth of this metropolis, that they will not conſider me as "their enemy," though I may be thought too officious in warning them of the danger contemplated by ſome of the moſt diſtinguiſhed patriots at that alarming criſis.

If the young American, with his wife and family, feel diſpoſed to have a Scotch factor or an Engliſh agent enjoy equal commercial advantages with themſelves, it is a misfortune for which I am not anſwerable, or think that the man who deprecates the tendency ariſing from ſuch evils is "their enemy," I muſt ſubmit to the implication; but let me aſſure ſuch inconſiderate revilers, that the time will ſoon arrive when they will *feel* the effects of their folly, and be *obliged* to acknowledge the man who forewarns them of the evil as their *beſt friend.*

No. LXII.

THE POLITICAL PHENOMENON.

THE preſent ſtate of politics in this country, muſt exhibit the United States as a phenomenon in the view of European nations. To obſerve individuals in a republican ſociety contending againſt thoſe vital principles, on which its legitimate permanency muſt exiſt----to read publications fraught with the moſt malignant calumny againſt the man who is deſirous to ſubſtantiate the full energy of thoſe doctrines, which have ever been conſidered as the bulwark of a free government----to ſee papers which are ſtyled *federal*, proſtituted to the baſe purpoſe of diſſolving the Union!---to find toaſts circulated around the feſtive board, tending to excite the moſt abhorrent paſſions, and countenanced by clerical characters, who profeſs to inculcate the benign maxim of "peace on earth and good will towards men"—to hear the full-toned organ (dedicated to hymns of praiſe and thankſgiving to the

great Ruler of the univerſe) leading in diſcordant notes to the ſanguinary ſong of blood and carnage among the citizens of the reſpective States! Inſtead of the angel of peace, to portray "the amputating knife," in the temple of Him, who declared, that "whoſoever drew the ſword ſhould periſh by the ſword!" To notice the hypocriſy of thoſe, who, while they pretend to eulogize Waſhington, are deſtroying the great *Legacy of Union*, which he bequeathed at the laſt moments of his exiſtence! To obſerve the baſe intrigues of men, who by falſehood and deception miſlead the honeſt yeomanry and tradeſmen of Maſſachuſetts, New-Hampſhire, and Connecticut, to counteract the principles ſo earneſtly recommended by this departed patriot! When, fellow-citizens, we view theſe things *ſyſtematically* purſued, have we not reaſon to pauſe and examine the characters who are doing the miſchief?

In the firſt place, if we look through the town of Boſton, can we find one man who was oppoſed to the revolution, but what is a reviler of Preſident Jefferſon? Or, is there one man among them, who was inimical to Waſhington, during the war, but what is now in oppoſition to Jefferſon?—Theſe men treated Waſhington, during our revolution, in the ſame manner they now do Jefferſon. Did they not repreſent *him* as the leader of an intolerant faction? Was not his conciliatory conduct treated with every indignity?—Were not his attempts to relieve us from *internal Britiſh taxes*, conſidered as infringing on the prerogative of King, Lords, and Commons?—Was not his oppoſition to the eſtabliſhment of a Judiciary, the judges of which were to remain *permanent under the pay of the crown*, denounced by the then Britiſh faction, as a *violation of the Conſtitution?* Was not the declaration of independence, though ſanctioned by the ſignature of Hancock and enforced by the ſword of Waſhington, called the "ſpeaking trumpet of rebellion"? Were we not then called upon, in the ſame tone of energy which now deſignates a Morris or a Bayard, to "pauſe, for heaven's ſake pauſe"? Were not the patriots of Congreſs denounced as a body of inſurgents, and were not the American army deſtined to the gibbet, in caſe their proweſs had not been equal to the great objects of our Independence?

If we had not ſucceeded, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, George Waſhington and a hoſt of heroes would have been handed down in the American hiſtory, in the ſame degrading point of view, as Preſident Jefferſon now ſtands in theſe papers devoted to a junto, who from the beginning were unfriendly to every republican character within the United States; and ſhould any *prominent* character, in the time of the revolution, be now countenanced by this party, it would be only in *proportion to his apoſtacy* from the great cauſe which brought him from obſcurity, and gave him a political reputation. In every inſtance, the Eſſex junto have ſupported the *old revolutionary patriots* ſo far, and no farther than they have renounced their republican creed. Though a man might at thoſe days oppoſe a feudal ſyſtem, yet if he is now in favour of an hereditary preſident and ſenate, they will receive him into full communion.

The preſent controverſy is not merely an oppoſition to Mr. Jefferſon, it is no more nor leſs than the outrageous effuſions of the enemies of our revolution, againſt republicaniſm; they may ſweeten the pill with federaliſm, to make it palatable, but depend on it the moſt component parts are the poiſonous ingredients of *toryiſm*. Theſe people find that the Preſident is reverting to original principles; they are anxious therefore to rally under falſe colours; they cry out *Waſhington*, and, like Judas, would ſalute him "hail, maſter, and kiſs him," but, at the ſame time, would if in their power, crucify him and every man who profeſſes to be his diſciple.

The tories always ſpoke one language—they do not argue, but declaim; they do not reaſon, but denounce; they do not attempt to convince, but alarm. They declared in 1775 that we had broken the Conſtitution; that deſtruction would follow our oppoſition to Britain; that we ought to pay taxes; that it was proper to have a ſtanding army; that a numerous body of officers, to live on the earnings of the people, were congenial with liberty; that a republican government was a volcano, which generated in its boſom the lava of its diſſolution. They attempted to diſſolve the union of the States, by ſhutting up the port of Boſton, and giving excluſive privileges to the other ſea-ports; they ſpread alarms among the people, and kept the continent in

one conſtant ſtate of perturbation; they told us that Adams and Hancock were traitors, and that a permanent judiciary, paid by the crown, was the only baſis of Engliſh liberty.

Is it not neceſſary then, fellow-citizens, to examine the deſigns of theſe men? Why is calumny heaped on the preſent adminiſtration? Why is diſunion advocated as the deſideratum of public happineſs? Why is the Preſident treated with ſuch pointed diſreſpect? Are you diſtreſſed by being relieved from taxes? Is the repeal of the exciſe on diſtilled ſpirits injurious, when on the commencement of this tax, Governour Strong and Mr. Dalton, Senators from this State, were oppoſed to the meaſure? If we now ſay the repeal is unjuſtifiable, we condemn Governour Strong, as he was, from the firſt introduction of this act, in the oppoſition. Can it be diſadvantageous to our citizens, when we paid 80,000 dollars, and Virginia only 40,000? Can it be beneficial for us to continue a tax which took twenty dollars out of every hundred to ſupport the various officers for collecting it, and which amounted to 180,000 yearly; every cent of which is ſaved to the people by aboliſhing the ſyſtem? Every other part of the internal taxes fell largely on the New-England States, and yet the tory faction are attempting to renew the ſyſtem, under the deceptive plea, that we are to be benefitted by the meaſure.

The judiciary is another ſource of complaint againſt the Preſident. But is there a man in the United States who wiſhes to extend this department of our government? Where is the man who candidly thinks that the bench and the bar, (though reſpectable as men) have not already their full preponderancy of weight in the community? Ye who attend our courts, and ye who have cauſes depending, examine the records and your own bills of coſt, and then anſwer whether the liberties and happineſs of America depend on an extenſion of judiciary prerogative? The man who has a diſpoſition to abuſe the preſent adminiſtration, for this timely check of profeſſional influence, muſt have been peculiarly fortunate in not being obliged to paſs the ordeal of a law-ſuit, otherwiſe the evidence would have been too forcible on his mind and purſe to admit a doubt as to the propriety of the repeal. To illuſtrate this remark, let the will of Waſhington ſpeak; as he therein declares, that all controverſies as they related to *his eſtate*, ſhould "be decided by three impartial and diſintereſt-

ed men." This is the deliberate voice of HIM in whom "*all hearts united.*" Who then can controvert the principle? Who then can vilify HONESTUS?

Have ye, fellow-citizens, gone to your homes, after attending a Circuit or Diſtrict Court, and bewailed the weakneſs and imbecility of the judiciary, as it relates to any one officer within the whole department? If it is true that the happineſs of our country wholly depends on giving further energy to the judiciary, in the name of liberty and independence, let us rally round this neglected and enfeebled part of our government—let us anathematize the Preſident and Congreſs—let us commence a cruſade to Waſhington-City, and under the banners of the judiciary, to the tune of "Rule New-England," let us entrench ourſelves within piſtol-ſhot of the Legiſlative and Executive—thus embodied and embattled, let us ſend in the articles of capitulation, and peremptorily demand an unequivocal compliance with our wiſhes!

To ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of the attack on Preſident Jefferſon's conduct, let us ſuppoſe that he had been at the head of the adminſtration the laſt four years; that the public debt had increaſed, though the revenue had been ſo abundantly productive from the European war; that he had raiſed an army evidently unneceſſary at the period of its eſtabliſhment; that he had burdened the citizens with exciſes, ſtamp duties, and a direct tax; that he had borrowed money at the unprecedented intereſt of 8 per cent. Suppoſe he had purſued a ſyſtem of expenditure upon a ſcale ſimilar to the above items, in moſt of his tranſactions—ſhould we not conſider it a happy event, if Mr. Adams had been choſen and in a few months had adopted meaſures exactly conformable to the preſent adminiſtration? Would not the people have thought it was a change for the better? Would they not have reaſon to be thankful, that the finances of government were adequate to all our purpoſes, while they felt themſelves relieved from ſuch a number of burthenſome taxes? This is a fair ſtatement of the queſtion, and if the Eſſex junto deny it, let them ſtate their objections.

Why then, fellow-citizens, is all this rancorous temper excited? How degrading muſt we appear in Europe, to find us abuſing the man, whoſe whole conduct appears directed to the public good! It is impoſſible, that the real friends to our country are the

authors of that calumny which daily appears in our papers—they must be enemies, lurking in our sea-ports and interior, men who are baffled in their designs to establish themselves and families on the ruin of our general prosperity. Let us be collected, cool and deliberate, and by *persevering* in the glorious cause of republicanism, we must obtain the victory; we shall "rise conquerors, yea more than conquerors," over the disturbers of our national quietude—we shall finally triumphantly sing,

"*Columbians never, never shall be slaves!*"

No. LXIII.

"STEADY HABITS."

IN all controversies, either religious or political, the parties generally adopt some laconic terms, which give celerity and facility in prosecuting their favourite tenets. *Orthodoxy* has had a wonderful effect in theological disputes; for who can be opposed to *orthodoxy?* Who can be an enemy to the *true faith?* The Calvinist claims this appellation; the Socinian enlists under this banner; the Universalist pleads *orthodoxy* as the ground-work of his profession; and even the *Shaker* exclaims, "orthodoxy! orthodoxy!"—Thus, in religion, we are oftentimes led by sounds, without attending to realities. Controversies have oftener originated from attachment to *names*, than from spiritual improvement and information; abuse and scurrility are frequently the weapons of opposition, and the purity of the subject is commonly lost in the impurity of the language.

Calumny never made a proselyte, though it generates hypocrites; a man who seeks popularity by sacrificing principle, may accommodate himself to a leading party, but he who has no other monitor than his own conscience, views with the utmost indifference the frowns of his enemies, and observes with ineffable contempt the base designs to injure his reputation. The whole history of the bible is fraught with similar sentiment, and when those who

pretend to profeſs doctrines contained in that holy record, calumniate as *orators* and defame as *politicians*, ſo far from ſubſtantiating their belief in what they profeſs, are, (like the hypocrites emphatically deſcribed in that ſacred volume) "*whitened ſepulchres*," which "within are full of all manner of uncleanlineſs." If a man inculcates the doctrine of our Saviour, "bleſſed are the peace-makers," yet if he violates the injunction by his practice, the ſincerity of his faith becomes doubtful.

In politics, as in religion, certain terms are uſed to accompliſh particular purpoſes. "*Steady habits*," in Connecticut, have been a ſignificant appellation to deſignate the different claſſes of citizens in their political ſentiments. When we hear a man in that ſtate, abuſing the Preſident, calumniating the adminiſtration, degrading every officer in the government, deprecating the repeal of internal taxes, and condemning the reſtoration of the judiciary ſyſtem, he generally concludes his outrageous obſervations with this emphatical declaration, that *he* is a friend to "*ſteady habits!*" He will in the moſt wanton manner vilify the character of his neighbour, who differs from him; violate all the benign attributes of candour and charity; and after anathematizing his opponents as the moſt abject beings in ſociety, he cloſes his illiberal remarks with an ejaculation to heaven, to *preſerve Connecticut in its* "*ſteady habits!*" he praiſes God that he is not a *Jefferſonian republican*, and that *Connecticut* is not like *Virginia*.

How a man can apply the "ſteady habits of Connecticut," in vindication of his abuſe to the preſent adminiſtration, is a myſtery too intricate to be explained. That ſtate, in all its governmental proceedings, purſues a ſyſtem the moſt analogous to Mr. Jefferſon's of any in the Union, and yet, wonderful to relate, are oppoſing his meaſures, under the falſe idea that he is infringing on *their* "*ſteady habits.*" The expenſes of their government are brought within the narroweſt point of parſimony; their elections are more frequent than in any other ſtate; their judges are choſen annually; the ſalaries of their reſpective officers are provident to a proverb; the people are induſtrious, and "earn their bread by the ſweat of their brow." Notwithſtanding which, ſuch has been the infatuation of many honeſt, well-diſpoſed perſons, (owing to the deception practiſed by the junto, in league with a few over-heated clergymen) that the very "habits" of that reſpectable ſtate are brought

as proofs of the impropriety of the preſent meaſures of government.

Why ſhould Connecticut be ſingled out in oppoſition to Mr. Jefferſon? If we analyſe his conduct, it exactly correſponds with the economical "ſteady habits" of that State. He has leſſened public taxes—he has reduced the number of ſupernumerary officers—he has brought the public expenditures within the revenue ariſing from *impoſt*—he has placed our finances on ſuch a baſis, that an 8 per cent. loan, it is probable, will never again be required—a land-tax cannot be expected to ariſe under his adminiſtration—*he has* RESTORED *the judiciary to the ſame ſtate in which Waſhington left it*, and has carefully avoided burdening the citizens with taxes for the ſupport of unneceſſary judges. Is it poſſible, then, that a real difficulty ſhould exiſt in Connecticut, when every meaſure ſo completely quadrates with their own ſcale of internal policy? The yeomanry muſt be deceived, if they ſuppoſe the former expenſive ſyſtem was more calculated for their intereſt and proſperity. I would venture to appeal to every farmer, whether the economy of the preſent, or the extravagance of the laſt adminiſtration, is moſt congenial to his wiſhes.

The landed intereſt is deeply connected with economy; other branches may ſtruggle under a weight of taxes, but the *farmer* muſt eventually fall a ſacrifice, if his earnings are taken to ſupport an adminiſtration founded on the "*innovating*" principle, that "a public debt is a public bleſſing." A public debt is no doubt a *private bleſſing*, by providing for a clan of lazy, idle ſycophants; but the folly of an oppoſite doctrine muſt be evident to men, who, from "habit," have become "ſteady" in preſerving among themſelves the principles of induſtry and economy.

It is rather laughable that the "ſteady habits" of CONNECTICUT ſhould become appropriate to extravagant federal meaſures—a Connecticut farmer in favour of a land-tax!—a Connecticut manufacturer an advocate for exciſes!—a Connecticut merchant a proſelyte for ſtamp duties!—a *Connecticut Chriſtian* deploring the repeal of a duty on his chaiſe, which conveys him and his family to the houſe of worſhip!—a Connecticut citizen lamenting that an eight per cent. loan is not neceſſary for the expenſes of government!! Theſe *ſtrange abſurdities*, however, have been the teſt of federaliſm. A Connecticut clergyman, who prays for a

connexion between Church and State, may anathematize those who have declared such "*innovations*" unnecessary; or a body of lawyers may anticipate a decrease of business, in consequence of opposite measures; but it is *impossible*, that the great body of citizens should consider as *grievances* a contrary line of procedure, unless the grossest deceptions have been practised on their credulity.

Can it be supposed, that Connecticut citizens will approve of a JUDICIARY, which claims a control *over the Legislature*, when they are so cautious of this branch of government as to choose their judges annually? Can they be in favour of a LAND-TAX, when their whole interest lies in this species of property? Will they be in favour of an EXCISE, when their grain furnishes such a supply for distillery? Can they approve of the "*innovation*" of an EIGHT PER CENT. LOAN, when all their transactions are within the old established usage of *six per cent.*? Or can the people confide in the integrity of a *few* federal clergymen, when they see an Huntington sacrifice every vestige of decency, and christian benevolence, in calumniating a clerical brother, merely for political purposes? "Such things are," but common sense forbids their continuance. It may answer for "half a time," but it cannot be durable, when information dispels the clouds of error and deception. The fact is, the citizens of the most republican States, have been led to support federal measures, not from *conviction*, but from *delusion*. The honesty of the people has been practised on by an artful, intriguing, priestly junto. Not that I do, or ever did, suppose that the clergy in *general* were opposed to republicanism, yet I believe, that the *subtlety of a few* has in many instances deceived many of the very elect. Owing to an uncommon exertion of the federal party, the good people of Connecticut have been *forced* to adopt sentiments contrary to every "steady habit" imbibed by themselves, and predecessors. They have been deceived by some spiritual leader, to embrace political doctrines subversive of all those legitimate practices, which have raised them to their present opulence, freedom, and respectability. A system of administration prosecuted on the same extravagant principles with the last, would have proved ruinous to every agricultural State in the Union. A standing army—a numerous body of excise men—a burdensome judiciary, with all the connexions attendant on a particular profession, might be advantageous to those who live by

the labour of others, or to thoſe who profit by litigious law-ſuits; but in a country, whoſe proſperity depends on agriculture, commerce and manufactures, all ſuch extraneous contingencies muſt prove deſtructive to the permanent happineſs of the people.

From the firſt ſettlement of America, ECONOMY and INDUSTRY were the "JACHIN and BOAZ" of the Northern States. In every Legiſlature, we find that the purſe-ſtrings were held with peculiar circumſpection. In Maſſachuſetts, the treaſury department is watched with hawk-eyed attention. Rhode-Iſland, Connecticut, and New-Hampſhire, have their "ſteady habits" in guarding againſt the inroads of extravagance. All money matters are conſidered with the utmoſt accuracy; they not only *weigh the gold* iſſuing from the treaſury, but alſo *weigh the meaſures* which draw it from the place of depoſit. An extravagant ſyſtem could never become popular in either of the Northern States. If any man ever took *New-England ground*, it is Mr. Jefferſon, and it only ſhews the folly of the federaliſts to expect to raiſe a formidable oppoſition to him from this quarter. He conforms his meaſures to our "habits;" he purſues ſuch a mode of conduct as muſt be univerſally approved; it is impoſſible he ſhould fail of ſucceſs, as he takes all our rules for his guidance and direction. Would a governour in Connecticut, Maſſachuſetts, Rhode-Iſland, or New-Hampſhire become unpopular by reducing taxes? Should we have thought, if a Britiſh governour had impoſed heavy duties before the revolution, that an American governour, by reducing them, was an enemy to our national happineſs? If, under Hutchinſon, we had a ſtamp-act, ſurely under Hancock we experienced the efficacy of the repeal. Theſe reflections are conſonant to our "ſteady habits;" they are the teſt of "New-England feelings, manners, and principles;" under no other regimen will "New-England rule" or be ruled; they are the tenets of legitimate orthodoxy; all other doctrines are hereſy, "*innovation*," "modern philoſophy," and political "atheiſm;" it is the new-fangled creed of the Eſſex junto, propagated by miſſionaries under the immediate patronage of their diſciples; it is promulgated by falſe prophets, aided by a *few* ignorant, ſupercilious prieſts; commiſſioned by a junto, who are planning the ruin of the country,

an alliance with Britain, a war with France, and the diſſolution of the Union !

Fellow-citizens !—This controverſy is plain to every man's underſtanding, and nothing is wanting to reſtore univerſal harmony, but to read and judge for yourſelves. Have your burdens increaſed ſince the inauguration of Mr. Jefferſon ? Has not your public credit riſen to an uncommon elevation ſince that period ? Wherein then is the difficulty ? I will tell you—a few men, who have anticipated the excluſive benefits of the federal government, by poſts of honour and profit ; who, under the laſt adminiſtration, had a proſpect of aggrandizing themſelves and families, at the expenſe of the public ; ſuch men, and their connexions, are diſappointed, by leſſening the ſources of their promotion, and the principal clamour ariſes from them. Common ſenſe dictates to us, that no real oppoſition can, or ever will ariſe among "THE PEOPLE," while their government is adminiſtered on the principles of economy ; *they* never will contend for a land-tax, a ſtamp-act, a ſtanding-army, or for a numerous corps of exciſemen ; *they* will not quarrel for ſupernumerary judges, or for the increaſe of the influence of the bar. The advocates for ſuch meaſures may cry aloud, but "THE PEOPLE" will turn a deaf ear to all their acclamations ; their "ſteady habits" can never be deranged by ſuch "*innovating*" projects. We may reſt aſſured, that a New-England-man never will exchange his plough for a muſket, to enforce additional taxes ; ſuch an abſurdity has never yet been practiſed among us, and I truſt never will.

No. LXIV.

THE CHURCH IN DANGER!!

"*SHOULD the* infidel JEFFERSON *be elected to the Presidency, the* seal of death *is that moment set on our holy Religion, our churches will be prostrated, and some* infamous prostitute, *under the title of the* Goddess of Reason, *will preside in the Sanctuaries now devoted to the Most High.*" New-England Palladium.

"*THIS unholy spirit of* Atheism *has* already *deteriorated the political and moral condition of* this *country, and still menaces our hopes, privileges and possessions.*"

Mr. Emerson's 4th of July Oration.

THE public mind has been so long "deteriorated" by alarms and apprehensions, that it is proper to arrest the attention of the citizens, to a candid reflection upon the above paragraphs. In a society, composed of men influenced by the precepts of religion, it is natural to suppose, when the cause of *christianity* is threatened with annihilation, that every serious member will be roused in its vindication. No wonder the federalists built their expectations on Connecticut and the Northern States; for if the election of Mr. JEFFERSON was to "seal with death our religion, prostrate our churches, and some infamous prostitute was to preside in the sanctuaries devoted to the Most High," it was full time for every religious "sect" to put on the whole armour "both of faith and practice." This is a high charge against the President, but like all other effusions of fanaticism, it falls by the pressure of its own weight.

Fellow-citizens—Let us for a moment *condescend* to reason with these men, who thus deprecated the election of Mr. Jefferson. He has been elected nearly eighteen months, and I would ask them

in what instance has "*the seal of death been set on our holy religion*"? In what city, town, or parish, has "the church been prostrated"? In what state has "an infamous prostitute presided in the sanctuaries of the Most High"? The *pious* Palladium said these things would take place at "*the moment* Mr. Jefferson was elected," and yet he has been President nearly eighteen months and not one particular has turned out in conformity to its prediction!

The federalists have of late become so insignificant in their observations, and expose themselves so grosly by their absurdities, that they are scarcely worthy a serious reply; for my own part, they are not viewed as antagonists; they are become rather the sport of satire, than the subjects of argument. The controversy is so unequal, that it is rather condescension that excites in me the common civility of refutation;—would a man, who values his reputation, presume to argue with those, who so often expose themselves to ridicule?

The pith and marrow of the whole federal "sect" are consolidated to the terrific charge, that Mr. Jefferson's election will endanger religion. This dreadful prediction, is proclaimed through the *consecrated* medium of the New-England Palladium. This infallible oracle receives an additional influence, by being edited by a Connecticut genius, who lately displayed his scientific knowledge, by inserting a receipt to make a *whortle-berry* (vulgarly called *huckle-berry,*) PUDDING? While he is thus anxious for a *good pudding*, we cannot but suppose he will be equally attentive to the moral virtues. When, therefore, it is declared, in a paper which travels by the bounty of federal charity into the mansion of almost every clergyman in New-England, that if Mr. Jefferson is chosen President, the churches will be prostrated, and that some hag will preside in the sanctuaries of the Most High, can we wonder that a temporary infatuation has bewildered the well-disposed citizens, and that a faction of old tories, should have excited a transient disgust against *the man* who penned that *declaration* which severed America from the fangs of Britain?

I have endeavoured, fellow-citizens, to treat every subject with deliberate consideration; but you must excuse me if I indulge a *humorous* excursion on the present occasion. Pray, *pious* editor, from whence did your distressing forebodings arise? who were the pioneers, armed with weapons of destruction, to level the *churches!*

who were the *notaries*, to set the seal of death on our holy religion? who were the artificers, to fashion out the image of the Goddess of Reason, and who were the banditti to erect it in the temple of the Most High? The absurdity of your declaration is evidenced by these inquiries, and yet you have solemnly told the citizens, that "*at the moment*" Mr. Jefferson was chosen, these evils would take place! Can you suppose that the people are so ignorant as to credit your absurdities? Has there been any attempt to accomplish your prophecies? What church is threatened with prostration? What reverend prelate is under bonds or imprisonment? Is any subordinate member of the church suffering persecution? Are not your clergy as well paid now as when Mr. Adams was President? Has any society lowered their annual salary? Are the reverend pastors called on to do more duty than formerly? or has the "*arduous* work of the ministry" increased? Have we heard of any "*innovations*" to lessen the income of the church? If these things have not taken place, what can be the meaning of the pious Palladium in denouncing the people as subverters of order and religion? Since the settlement of this country, the clergy never *lived easier* than at the present day. It is ungenerous then to be abusing the people as atheists, deists, and disorganizers, when their whole conduct proves the fallacy of such epithets.

So far from churches being "*prostrated*," new ones are daily erecting; proposals for building meeting-houses are more frequent in our newspapers than formerly. In Boston we shall soon see the *New-North* rise more glorious than the former temple; if we prostrate an *old church*, it is to raise a more splendid *new one* in its place. Since Mr. Jefferson's election, we find religion is as highly rated as ever; *some* societies are *liberal in procuring pastors*, while others are as tenacious in estimating them at their *full value*; even the old-fashioned pride is banished, of crouding all *respectable families* in the broad-aisle and on the lower floor, and *gallery pews* are now sought for with the greatest avidity. In short, every thing about the churches looks as flourishing since the election of Mr. Jefferson as before; instead of beholding "*an infamous prostitute*" presiding in our sanctuaries, they were never more ornamented with LADIES, comely in their attire, and attractive in their deportment.

These things being facts, is it not surprising that a man from Connecticut should make a declaration so contrary to truth? that he should raise a false alarm, and put the whole Christian church into consternation? Or, how can any man, clothed in sacerdotals, seriously assert, that "*atheism* is deteriorating the moral and religious condition of this country," when every appearance carries such strong conviction to the contrary, and when he knows there is not one *professed atheist* on the continent? How can we reconcile these declarations, when the revival of religion is so powerful (stated in the Evangelical Magazine) as to "*knock down*" by the terror of the law, thousands of men, women and children? How are we menaced with an annihilation of all morality, when "whole forests are illuminated with lamps" to guide the heavenly pilgrims to the place of worship? When men thus impose on the public, it is but justice to the cause of virtue and religion to notice their absurdities, to expose their folly, and hold them up as objects of derision.

A trifling parade of assumed consequence; a pedantic display of classical erudition, interspersed with a few vitiated pronunciations of the American dialect, may give a person a vast idea of his own importance; but men of cool reflection easily discover the gauze covering, which screens such pretenders from the public eye.

It is worthy of observation, that every prediction of the federalists has proved false, as it related to Mr. Jefferson's election. They not only told us that religion was to be banished from our country, but that the public credit would be sacrificed, and that commerce would be wholly unprotected. Instead of which, *religion* has risen to an uncommon elevation, if the accounts of the Missionary Societies can be credited; the *public stocks* are higher than for many years, and our remaining ships of war have protected our Mediterranean trade, even beyond what they did when their numbers were much larger.

Fellow-citizens!—Be no longer deceived; assume your wonted position; let not fanaticism on one side, and apathy on the other, lead you from your duty; act like *men* in deliberation, and like *brethren* in decision; your enemies are few, though violent in their opposition; they buz like a disturbed hive, but their clamours must eventually cease. *They* want an expensive government, and

the queſtion is ſimply this, *Are the People in favour of taxes*, when they are not needed? Let the queſtion be taken throughout the Northern States—YEA or NAY—*Ye who are in favour of heavy taxes, pleaſe to manifeſt it?* If the tories want to know the public opinion on this ſubject, let them try it in town-meeting, or even at Vila's caucus.

No. LXV.

THE WORLD TURNED UPSIDE DOWN!!

"*Thoſe men, who have turned the world upſide down, have come hither alſo.*"

IS it *poſſible*, that the chriſtian diſpenſation ſhould raiſe a formidable oppoſition from men who pretended to diſown all worldly grandeur and emoluments, and who lived in expectation of a reward in another world? But however paradoxical it may appear, yet the only antagoniſts which gave our Saviour or his diſciples any trouble, were thoſe who profeſſed the greateſt concern for religion, and who lived within the purlieus of the altar. The whole hiſtory of the chriſtian ſyſtem is a narrative of the ſcandalous treatment of the chief prieſts, ſcribes, and Phariſees, towards its profeſſors. They were followed by a body of perſecutors, who were conſtantly exciting the public reſentment againſt them. The enemies of our Saviour proſecuted their plans with ſuch inſidious art, as even to gain over, by *bribery*, one of his diſciples, to betray him. He was early purſued by Church and State: for Herod began his ſanguinary purpoſes by murdering the infants in Bethlehem. When that failed of the object contemplated, Satan, immediately upon his baptiſm, in a courteous ſtrain of adulation, *tempted* him. After the powers of earth and hell had exhauſted all their ſtratagems to enſnare and deſtroy him, he began his miſſion by preaching on the mount, and from that *eminence* made a

solemn declaration of the benign principles of his mission; he recommended his ministration by acts of kindness and beneficence; healing all manner of diseases, and evidencing his divinity by signs and miracles, which gave a lustre to the philanthropy of his character. Is it *possible*, then, that any opposition could arise against a system which displayed such complacency in its Author? Should we expect to find among his opponents, those who professed to study the happiness of mankind, or seemed devoted to the cause of virtue and religion? But the history informs us, "that when the chief priests, scribes and Pharisees saw the things which he did, they were displeased, and from that time sought to lay hands on him; *but they feared the people.*" The Pharisees also took counsel "how they might entangle him in his talk." They began their artifice by questioning him, whether it was lawful to give *tribute* to CÆSAR? They were preparing to entrap him that he was not *Cæsar's friend*; but our Saviour, though thus surrounded by a *junto*, boldly began his opposition, by denouncing them as hypocrites and deceivers. The Sadducees next came forward, "who say, there is no resurrection;" thus combining *Church and State*, as it related to taxes to Cæsar, and the final retribution of mankind. The *money-changers*, it is probable, were greatly disturbed in consequence of being "whipped out of the temple;" they therefore allied themselves with the Sadducees, in order to form a *federal connexion* with this powerful "sect." The Pharisees seemed greatly alarmed, when they found he had put the Sadducees to silence, and they gathered together and deputized a *lawyer* to ask him a question, for the purpose of *tempting* him.

After he had cofounded this *last tempter*, (from "the bar,") no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man, from that day forth, ask him any more questions. As soon, therefore, as our Saviour had defeated the scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, chief priests, Satan, and the lawyer, he began to speak to *the people* and his disciples. He appears, at this period of his ministration, convinced of the opposition which he was to encounter, and therefore began his mission by warning them of the deceptive arts of those who had long deceived them under the mask of hypocrisy. Matthew, in his 23d chapter, (which I recommend to my readers to peruse) begins his narrative in a most triumphant manner: after describing the complete victory of our Saviour over his

antagoniſts, he goes on, "Then ſpake he to the *multitude* (which ſhews that he did not conſider "*the people*" as "wolves," or *themſelves* as their "worſt enemies") ſaying, the ſcribes and Phariſees ſet in Moſes' ſeat, but do not *ye* after *their* works; for they *ſay*, and *do not*; they bind heavy burdens, and lay them on men's ſhoulders, but they *themſelves* will not move them with one of their fingers; they love the uppermoſt rooms at feaſts, and the chief ſeats in the ſynagogue, and greetings in the market place, and to be called of men, Rabbi, rabbi." After deſcribing theſe perſons in their proper characters, he goes on for 39 verſes, calling them hypocrites, devourers of widows' houſes, children of hell, blind guides, extortioners, whited ſepulchres, ſerpents, generation of vipers, *perſecutors of wiſe men*, and finally cloſes with this tremendous denunciation—"on whoſe head be all the *righteous blood*, ſhed on the earth, from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, ſon of Barachias, whom they ſlew between the temple and the altar."

The Chriſtian ſyſtem being thus oppoſed to all the hypocriſy and intrigue of deſigning men, to a phalanx of *church and ſtate*, to all thoſe who found it their intereſt to deceive the multitude, (to whom our Saviour preached) can we wonder that they combined in a *federal aſſociation* to deſtroy the efficacy of his doctrines, depreciate his reputation, and repreſent him and his followers as "turning the world upſide down"? Can we ſuppoſe that any cordiality could ever exiſt between Him, who told the people (whom they had before held in ſubjection and dread) that they were deceivers and apoſtates? No; "for it came to paſs *immediately* after he had finiſhed *all theſe ſayings*, that the *chief prieſts and ſcribes* aſſembled in the palace of the *high prieſt*, and conſulted how they might take him by *ſubtlety*, and kill him; they ſaid, not on the feaſt-day, leſt there be an uproar *among The People*." In all this divine ſtory, there ſeems to be two parties; *the people* in favour, and the *chief prieſts*, &c. in oppoſition. Till, at length, by the baſeſt practices of bribery and perſecution, (as in the inſtance of thruſting out the man cured of his blindneſs) they excited the fears of the populace, by crying out that religion was in danger; that his followers were not *Cæſar's friends*; and that he was a "peſtilent fellow." By ſuch inflammatory declarations, they ſo far perſuaded the people to

conſent to his crucifixion, as even to demand the releaſe of Barabbas, rather than our Saviour. The "reign of terror," at that time, muſt have been of the moſt vindictive nature; for thoſe who had experienced the efficacy of his miracles, were in general afraid to ſpeak in his vindication. Nicodemus (though a ruler) dare not make his viſits but in the moſt ſecret hours of the night. Joſeph was cautious how far he acknowledged Him openly; and not till after the higheſt manifeſtations of his divinity, did he dare to beg the body, to be placed in his ſepulchre.

Under this preſſure of *clerical* and *civil* intereſt, we cannot be ſurpriſed that the multitude at length became the revilers of Him and his apoſtles. The clergy of that day, no doubt, preached ſermons to influence the public mind. The multitude were told, that he meant to ſubvert all religion; that he was a deſpiſer of ordinances; that he abuſed the *whole body* of the clergy; and that all property, all the churches, and every veſtige of piety and morality would be annihilated. On all public occaſions, it is probable, the "lawyer who tempted him" would be declaiming that the courts of juſtice would be aboliſhed, and that he had denounced the whole ſanhedrin of judges as hypocrites and devourers of widows' houſes. When He, and his apoſtles, preached up peace on earth and good will towards men, the ſycophants of the clerical party confounded every appeal to common ſenſe, by crying out, "Great is Diana of the Epheſians." Such was their influence in exciting the public odium, that even Paul and Silas were mobbed in Theſſalonica, as men "*turning the world upſide down.*" The enemies of the apoſtles had ſo far bewildered the people, that the charge of overturning religion was blended with the political hereſy, that they did "*contrary to the decrees of Cæſar.*" All the beneficent actions of the apoſtles were ſtyled "turning the world upſide down"; all their exhortations were "modern philoſophy," or, in other words, deſtroying thoſe "ſteady habits" long imbibed under the diſcipline of pretended *orthodoxy*, or "blue law" eſtabliſhments. To raiſe an oppoſition to men thus circumſtanced, was not a difficult buſineſs to be accompliſhed, by their adverſaries; a combination of ſuch characters, all poſſeſſing an extenſive perſonal influence, aſſiſted with the electrical watch-word that *the church was in danger*, was an onſet too powerful to be withſtood by ſuch weak "*miſſionaries*" (without purſe or ſcrip) as Paul and Silas.

The foregoing obſervations are drawn from facts in the bible, which cannot be controverted; they are mentioned to ſhew the effects of a combination of men, when united in oppoſition to any meaſures, however beneficial to the general intereſt of mankind; eſpecially if they have a tendency to weaken their influence, counteract their deſigns, or leſſen their pecuniary emoluments. By creating a conſtant irritation in the public mind, they will prejudice the well-diſpoſed, and, oftentimes, the well-informed citizens, againſt their beſt friends. They will perſuade many, that thoſe who are attempting to relieve the burdens of mankind, are "*turning the world upſide down*"; or, in other words, that keeping the people *upright*, in defence of their national rights, is *overturning* them. They will, by a continual clamour, excite ſuſpicions againſt men whoſe moral characters can in no inſtance be impeached, and whoſe political ſentiments are in uniſon with the fundamental principles of the Conſtitution.

If theſe events took place under the mild miniſtration of the chriſtian ſyſtem; if it was poſſible to rouſe the vengeance of the people againſt the doctrines which inculcated peace on earth and good will towards men; can we be ſurpriſed, under a ſimilar combination, they ſhould now be under a temporary deluſion, to miſtake their political, as they then did their religious, bleſſings? If it was *then* in the power of a junto of intereſted men to perſuade the people that to do juſtice, love mercy, and walk humbly with God, were tenets deſtructive of the harmony of ſociety, and that the preachers of ſuch rational maxims were "turning the world upſide down"; we can eaſily perceive that the ſame practices on their credulity might perſuade them, that leſſening the public taxes, repealing a ſtamp-act, removing uſeleſs offices, abridging a ſupernumerary body of judges, and diſcharging the public debt, were equally as deſtructive to the happineſs of the community; and that the men who attempted to do theſe things were alſo, like Paul and Silas, "turning the world upſide down." A *judge Baſſett*, like *Demetrius* of old, might, with equal ſucceſs, cry out, "*the* CRAFT *is in danger!*"

I would here obſerve, that ſo far from wiſhing to depreciate the character of the *clergy, as a body*, by the foregoing obſervations, they are meant to place them in that reſpectable ſituation to which their profeſſion entitles them. The hiſtory of the Chriſtian relig-

ion justly appreciates the *sincere preachers* of the gospel. The apostles, and all true believers, were ever estimated as the "salt of the earth." But our Saviour's denunciations were solely confined to certain men, who styled themselves "*chief priests*"; who assumed a control over church and state; who were "busy-bodies"; who were blending the politics of Cæsar with the prophesies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c.; men who claimed precedence in all processions, and who minded earthly, more than spiritual, things. The clergy are a valuable body in society, and no man, who regards the welfare of his country would wish to see the mone grade below their just estimation. But those, who aim at the rank of *chief priests*, and who calumniate (in sermons, orations, &c.) men much better than themselves, must, at this enlightened age, expect to fall into disrepute, unless they take more heed to their ways and become more circumspect in their manners.

Neither is there any intention to reflect on the *lawyers, as a body*, by mentioning one of the order as a *tempter*; for if the Jewish sanhedrin could get but *one*, (and no doubt *he* was *well fee'd*,) it is rather a compliment on the profession: And we candidly hope, they could not procure *more than one* at the present day. The *known piety* of the "order," in these days, would secure them from having this charge brought against them.

No. LXVI.

THE TOWN-CLERK OF EPHESUS!

TEXT—"*And when the* Town-Clerk *had appeased the people, he said, ye men of Ephesus, what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess* DIANA, *and of the image which fell down from* JUPITER? *Seeing then that these things cannot be* spoken against, *ye ought to be quiet and do nothing rashly. For ye have brought hither these men, who are neither* robbers of churches, *nor yet blasphemers of your goddess. Wherefore, if Demetrius, and the craftsmen which are with him, have a matter against any man, the law is open and there are deputies; let them implead one another.*"

THE scriptures were written for edification, and if we practise the doctrines they inculcate, we are promised not only the blessings of this life, but that which is to come. If any book inculcates *republicanism*, and reprobates an *aristocracy*, either *civil* or *ecclesiastical*, it is the Bible. The whole tenor of the sacred writings runs in unison with the rights of "THE PEOPLE," in opposition to a certain "self-created" body, who assume the power to dictate and control public opinion. The "multitude," and "the people," are the only objects contemplated in all the addresses made by our Saviour and his apostles. If they now were on earth their language would be stigmatized as jacobinism and illuminati—if we heard them denouncing one monarchical magistrate as a "whited sepulchre"—if we saw them whipping out the money-changers—if we found them assembling the multitude, speaking to the people, and in every instance reprobating the chief priests as hypocrites and deceivers, our *junto gentry* would be clamorous in vociferating "away with them, away with them"—"crucify him, crucify him."

The story of Paul's entering Ephesus is a true representation of church infatuation, when set in motion by a few interested individ-

uals. On his arrival, and in order to counteract Paul's miniſtration, the ſeven ſons of one Sceva, "*chief of the prieſts*," attempted to exerciſe the miraculous power of caſting out evil ſpirits; but though this ſame Sceva could deceive the people, yet he could not deceive the devil, for the man in whom the evil ſpirit was, "leaped on them and prevailed againſt them, and Sceva's ſeven ſons fled out of the houſe naked and wounded." In this inſtance, Satan himſelf ſeemed to act with ſome generoſity, for the evil ſpirits retorted on theſe deceivers with a degree of ſeverity—"Jeſus we know, and Paul we know, *but who are ye?*" It is probable this Sceva was an artful prieſt, who had made himſelf very buſy in exciting alarms among the people; had told them that there was an organized body of illuminati, who were going to overturn all religion; had propagated ſtories about maſſacres, and that the world was going to be "turned upſide down." Sceva, therefore, thought he was competent to ſet up in oppoſition to Paul, and, by a little ſtratagem, could make his exorciſm appear the genuine diſplay of evangelical influence. In conſequence of theſe artful proceedings, he and his ſeven ſons had gained to themſelves a high reputation at Epheſus; and the people, acting under their infatuation, were led to lay violent hands on the apoſtles. The firſt attack on Paul, however, did not ſucceed; Sceva was proved an impoſtor, and his ſons were obliged to flee out of the houſe naked and wounded.

At length a more powerful antagoniſt appeared; one Demetrius, a *ſilver-ſmith*, who made ſhrines for Diana, aſſembled his fellow-craftſmen, and began a moſt violent onſet, by crying out, "*the craft is in danger!* great is Diana of the Epheſians!" He further declared, if theſe men were ſuffered to proceed, the profits of his buſineſs would ceaſe; and emphatically concluded, "*Ye know, that by this craft we get our wealth.*" This hue and cry put the whole city in confuſion; ſome cried one thing and ſome another, and for two hours was heard the inceſſant clamour of "great is Diana of Epheſus!" Who could have thought a *ſilver-ſmith*, in the city of Epheſus, could have raiſed ſuch a formidable party?

In this ſtate of things, what muſt have been the ſituation of Paul and his companions! Sceva, and his ſeven ſons, wounded and naked; Demetrius, with his whole body of ſilver-god makers, rouſing the people to the higheſt pitch of reſentment; the

whole city in uproar, againſt two or three unarmed men ; and it is to be feared, if the *Town-Clerk* had not came forward at this critical moment, to appeaſe the people, they would have been ſtoned, or put to death, by Demetrius and his aſſociates.

In this part of my obſervations, the reflections, which naturally occur, are :—that when any doctrine is inculcated, or any meaſure purſued, which interferes with the intereſt of men who practiſe on the religious prejudices of the people, it is their cuſtom to alarm them, that all their religious ceremonies are to be aboliſhed ; and to excite a jealouſy and enthuſiaſm againſt the men who are endeavouring to relieve them from their impoſitions. This uproar was occaſioned by Demetrius, not that he cared for the temple, otherwiſe than by making ſhrines, by which he and his fellow-craftſmen had enriched themſelves at the expenſe of the ignorant Epheſians. If the apoſtles had propoſed a number of golden or ſilver crucifixes, or had ordered a large paraphernalia of plated decorations for the altar, or *copper-bottomed* all the men-of-war at Epheſus, and had employed Demetrius to do the buſineſs, it is probable he would have been among the foremoſt to eſcort Paul into Epheſus. No doubt there would have been a high cavalcade, conſiſting of Demetrius' workmen, prieſts of the temple, and all the expectants, " more or leſs," of the apoſtle's patronage. Songs would have been ſung in praiſe of Paul, and his religious ſyſtem ; addreſſes would have been preſented, from all the various orders of Church and State ; Sceva and his retinue would have been clothed in facerdotals, and probably would have delivered an oration in favour of this modern philoſophy. A public dinner would have been provided ; a poet-laureat choſen, and poſſibly all the young men been called on to celebrate the diſſolution of the religion of Diana, and the city would have been in uproar with " *Great is Paul of Macedon !*" inſtead of " Great is Diana of the Epheſians."

But it was not ſo—the Chriſtian ſyſtem offered no ſuch excitements. Without purſe, without ſcrip, the apoſtles had to travel from city to city ; they were at war with all money-getting religion ; they were not helping the magiſtrate to impoſe on the people, or the prieſt to attach the civil code to the horns of the altar ; even the religion itſelf was offered " without money and without price." No ' Peter's pence' was connected with Paul's embaſſy ;

what he got by the sale of his tents, was the principal part of his support. Who then can be surprised, that an uproar should be raised at Ephesus, where the religion of Paul struck all the silver gods out of existence. If Paul's religion had succeeded, how many temple-workmen would have been out of employ—Poor Demetrius would have been obliged to seek another mode of religion. Even though this silver-smith might have been employed in copper, or yet might have turned his attention to the iron foundery, still the little *silver gods* were a sure and lasting line of business, and he did not know how long the other might continue. If tho goddess was destroyed, all his other employment was uncertain; he might have been permitted to fulfil some previous contract, but the temple! the temple! being annihilated, all the rest was as the "baseless fabric of a vision."

But the principal character in this story is the TOWN-CLERK. What an excellent thing it is to have a good Town-Clerk. Whether they chose this officer annually, or whether he was turned out the next election for the part he took against the priest Sceva, and Demetrius the silver-smith, we are not told; but that he acted like an honest man, on the present occasion, cannot be controverted. Amid the general convulsion of the citizens, and in opposition to the prevailing party, he had the resolution to speak to the people, and caution them against proceeding too rashly with the apostles.

It does not appear that he concerned himself about the wounded sons of Sceva, or addressed himself to Demetrius, but he made immediate application to "THE PEOPLE." He began his speech with "ye men of Ephesus," and in order to give the true meaning of what I propose in this Number, I will attempt to modernize his language, and apply my discourse through the medium of the Town-Clerk.

"Ye men of Ephesus," why is all this uproar in the city? the men whom you charge with destroying religion, and robbing the churches, have in no instance done as you have been instructed. The churches remain in the same state of quietude as before, and the funding system (the modern temple of Diana) and all the other pecuniary establishments, are more permanent than under your former establishment. If Demetrius cannot get so much profit by his craft, yet you get more for your six per cents. your

bank ſtocks, and all other matters connected with your fiſcal arrangements. If you are relieved from your ſtamp-duties, land-tax, loans at an extra intereſt, yet if Demetrius, by theſe meaſures, finds a drawback in his income, ſo much money is ſaved in your own pockets. Why then are you diſturbed? What profit is it to you, to feed men who live by your earnings, and when every ſhilling they gain is a diſcount from your living? If the government is thus adminiſtered for your benefit, why ſhould you make a riot becauſe a number of *hangers-on* are *ſhaken off*, as incumbrances? Do the wheels of government need a clog? If five thouſand men can be ſet at work to earn a living, without being burthenſome to the community (as exciſe-officers, ſtamp-officers, &c.) is it any diſadvantage to thoſe who had to pay them? If the Preſident tells you, he can anſwer all public exigencies without theſe taxes, why are you clamorous to burden yourſelves, when he ſays he does not require it? We have a great number of Demetriuſes who live by the craft of deception, and when they are thrown out of buſineſs they will make a great noiſe and diſturb the city; but what is Demetrius to you? By feeding him, you ſtarve yourſelves. While he is furniſhing ſilver gods at your expenſe, to burniſh up the temple of Diana, you are growing poor, and depriving your wives and children of the means of ſuſtenance. Of what ſervice was a ſtamp-act? Did it make your property more ſecure? But if it is equally as ſecure without it, why do you clamour at its repeal? Of what ſervice was a ſtanding-army? While they were in exiſtence, were your eſtates or your lives in leſs jeopardy? If they are now ſecure, why do you need them? Of what ſervice was an eight per cent. loan? Did gratifying a few uſurers, enrich you? Of what ſervice was a land-tax? It ſerved to create a hoſt of officers, but the advantage was very ſmall to thoſe who paid it. If you can now ride in a chaiſe, without a tax, is it not better to apply this money to ſhoeing your horſes, and mending the tackling, than ſupporting collectors?

Why then, "ye men of Epheſus," are you thus uneaſy? Why all this uproar? Let Demetrius do as all honeſt citizens ought to do, earn his living by induſtry, and not by impoſition. Support the men who are willing to relieve you from taxes; and never let the great city of Epheſus be again diſturbed by a ſet of noiſy, lazy

ſycophants, who only pay court to thoſe who feed them from honeſt men's pockets. Beſides, why do you clamour in this incoherent manner? Bellowing "Adams and Liberty," "Jacobin," &c. convinces no man. If you have any charge againſt your magiſtrates, is not the law open? not the unwritten judiciary, not the vague common law of England, but the *written* laws of the land. Impeach them before the conſtituted authorities. Ye have deputies and lawyers in abundance; one half of the money you have given towards paying unneceſſary officers, would be a handſome fee to the whole body of attornies. Act like men, "ye citizens of Epheſus," and do not become a bye-word and deriſion among the citizens of the earth.

And when the Town-Clerk had thus ſpoken, each man went away to his own home, and the city was quiet.

No. LXVII.

THE WOLVES, AND THE NOBILITY.

TEXT—"*The love of liberty (ſays* SAMUEL ADAMS*) is interwoven in the ſoul of man.*" "*So it is, (ſays* JOHN ADAMS*) according to La Fontaine, in that of a* wolf: *and I doubt whether it be much more* rational, generous, *or* ſocial, *in one than in the other, until in* man *it is enlightened by experience, reflection, education, and* civil *and* political *inſtitutions, which are* firſt produced, *and* conſtantly ſupported *and* improved *by a* FEW—*that is, by the NOBILITY.*"

THE epiſtolary correſpondence between Mr. John Adams and Mr. Samuel Adams is important, as it contains political principles which are highly intereſting to the happineſs and proſperity of this country. The Letters are written with that cordiality, as it relates to the opinion which they entertain of each other's integrity, that we are to view them as the eſtabliſhed tenets of two old

civilians, who have made up their judgment from experience and reflection.

The extracts which I have taken, appear to comprize the essence of the controversy. On the one side, Mr. Samuel Adams says, "the love of liberty is interwoven in the soul of man"; Mr. John Adams answers, "so it is, according to La Fontaine, in that of a wolf"; and further declares, that "he doubts whether it is much more rational, &c. in one than in the other, until in man it is enlightened by experience, education, and *civil* and *political institutions*, which are at *first produced*, and constantly supported and *improved* by a *few*—that is, by the NOBILITY."

Here, then, these two gentlemen are at issue; and it is a question of the highest consideration which of them is the most accurate. If the love of liberty is not more rationally interwoven in the human soul than in a wolf, and if it wholly depends for existence on being cherished by a body of men, which he is pleased to style a "nobility," dreadful indeed is the situation of society. Does the history of mankind exhibit evidence, that a particular order of men, denominated *nobles*, feel those impressions, or are endowed with that benevolence, as to produce, cherish, and constantly support the liberties of the people? Are the people as savage as wolves? are they as ferocious and destructive, in their habits and manners, as this voracious animal? or are they "*their own worst enemies*," unless the benign hand of a *nobility* is stretched out for their protection? In what instance does this doctrine apply to the citizens of America? Were the first settlers of this country thus designated? Were our venerable forefathers as hostile as wolves to each other, when they landed on the American shores? Was not the love of liberty interwoven in their souls, when they forsook the luxurious soil of Britain, to seek an asylum in this desolate territory? Did they suppose it necessary to bring a body of *noblemen*, to protect them from devouring each other? or did they contemplate the establishment of political institutions, with a branch emphatically denominated a *nobility?* Did this aristocratical part of the British government give them any assistance, while they were contending against the arbitrary measures of England, before their embarkation? or did they receive consolation from the House of Lords, after their arrival? No; the love of liberty was interwoven in their souls, and they formed political institutions

founded on principles in every reſpect conformable to ſuch feelings. Juſt emancipated from the thraldom of a Britiſh government, they were led to adopt a ſyſtem of political regulation which gave the faculties of the mind their utmoſt energies, and never degraded themſelves to contemplate their little ſociety as wolves, ſtanding in need of a ſuperior order to check their ſovereignty.

The ſentiment advanced by Mr. John Adams, might have been expected from a crowned head in Europe ; it might have made a ſublime paragraph in the writings of Burke : But that it ſhould ariſe from a perſon who had been converſant in the hiſtory of this country, and had been in our councils during the American revolution, is rather a ſurpriſing and alarming conſideration. I would aſk Mr. John Adams, in what particular are the citizens of America in any degree analogous to wolves ? or in what inſtance has it been neceſſary that our political inſtitutions ſhould be improved and ſupported by a *nobility ?* Did the people ſhew any ſavage diſpoſition in their conteſt with Britain ? Was it not the love of liberty, interwoven in the ſoul, that produced our oppoſition to Britiſh tyranny ? Our "town-meetings" were the pure effuſions of liberty ; our "College" *(at that time)* breathed the ſpirit of freedom and the rights of man. The youth of that day, on commencement anniverſaries, were eager to diſplay the manly ſentiments of freemen ; the orations and exhibitions all tended to rouſe the mind to contemplate political ſubjects on the broadeſt baſis of *equal rights.* Our patriots had the ſupport of the people ; Faneuil-Hall and the Old South often reſounded with the acclamations of citizens, collected to ſupport the great principles of their free conſtitution. The *tories*, it is true, conſidered the town of Boſton as a den of wolves ; they ſuppoſed it neceſſary that a body of nobility ſhould be created to check and control them ; Hutchinſon and Oliver even wrote to the miniſtry for this purpoſe, and when their letters were diſcovered, the general diſguſt of the people convinced them in what abhorrence they were held.

Did not Mr. John Adams find that the ſpirit of liberty was interwoven in the ſoul of the people, when he was in Congreſs during our revolution ? It was this ſpirit that originated that body. The people called for this aſſembly of the States ; the election of the members was the evidence of the ſpirit of liberty

exiſting within them. The people had no idea that a body of nobility was neceſſary for their ſecurity; they choſe honeſt men from among them, who were in the ſame grades of life with themſelves; they did not vote for *my Lord Such-a-one*, or *Duke Such-a-one;* the candidates in general were ſcarcely complimented with the title of *eſquire*. When this reſpectable body aſſembled, whom did they addreſs? Were not all their applications made to the people? Who formed the army? Did not tradeſmen and farmers compoſe the American phalanx? Who commanded and manned our ſhips of war and privateers? were they dukes, earls, or lords? No; the people—the people—the plain American citizens, whoſe ſouls were invigorated with liberty, unawed by a nobility, and who diſdained to conſider themſelves under their immediate protection; theſe were the ſoldiers who fought our battles; theſe were the ſailors, who, even at that period, rendered the flag of America reſpectable and dreaded.

I cannot but wonder how a ſentiment of the kind could be advanced by Mr. John Adams. That the people are not more rational in ſupport of their liberties than *wolves*, unleſs ſupported by a *nobility*,—is, of all declarations, the moſt extraordinary. In the days of adverſity, Mr. John Adams knew the obligation he was under to the people; a ſentiment of this kind, coming from a member of our firſt Congreſs, would have raiſed the continent to a flame. Suppoſe it had then been ſaid, that the people cannot be truſted; we muſt have a nobility to govern; we muſt put this nobility into a "*hole*," and from this ſubterraneous cell we muſt rely for all our ſuccour. The Britiſh army would have been pleaſed with ſuch a viſionary oppoſition; Lord Howe would rather have heard of one hundred thouſand noblemen in a "HOLE," than twenty thouſand Yankees in the field. *Bunker-Hill* was not defended by men thus in covert; no, the citizens did not lurk in *holes*, but ſtood on eminences. Warren ſcorned to be hid in a cave, but ſtood in the front rank, in defence of that liberty which was interwoven in his ſoul, and in the ſouls of his brave companions. The immortal Waſhington looked to his comrades of citizen-ſoldiers; he did not inquire whether there was a body of nobility to ſecure his retreat. He did not view his choſen band as *wolves*, but conſidered himſelf at the head of men; whoſe ſouls were invigorated with the powerful energies of liberty.

If the love of liberty (as is declared by Mr. Samuel Adams) was not interwoven in the ſoul of man, it would have been impoſſible to have effected the Independence of America. What but this ſuſtained the ſpirits of an army conſtantly on fatigue? What but this cheered the war-worn ſoldier, when deſtitute of clothing and the common neceſſaries of life? What but this animated the American veterans to contend againſt the formidable troops of Britain, with ſcarcely a cartridge for their defence, or a drop of cheering comfort in their canteens? What ſpirit ſhort of this, rallied the undiſciplined troops of Starks, to attack and capture the boaſting Burgoyne? To what energy of the human mind are we indebted for the ſurrender of Cornwallis? Was it the refined ſpeculations of a nobility groping in a hole, or was it the irreſiſtible impulſe of freemen, embodied to expreſs thoſe feelings which were interwoven in every fibre of their ſouls?

I would not wiſh to put an uncandid conſtruction on the paragraph ſelected from the Letters, but if there is any preciſe idea expreſſed by Mr. John Adams, it appears to be this—that the people are as voracious, ſavage and irrational as *wolves*, unleſs they are enlightened by political inſtitutions, which are at *firſt produced, conſtantly ſupported*, and *improved* by a NOBILITY. If I am not correct in my concluſions, I ſhall readily acknowledge my error; but the Engliſh language cannot convey a ſtronger idea to my mind of the real political principles of any individual, however diſagreeable may be the application.

Admitting my premiſes to be ſubſtantiated, how far does Mr. John Adams's declaration conform to our bill of rights, which emphatically ſtates, "that government is inſtituted for the common good—that *the people alone* have an inconteſtible, *unalienable* and indefeaſible right to inſtitute government—that the idea of a man born a magiſtrate, law-giver, or judge, is abſurd and unnatural." If Mr. John Adams is right the conſtitution is wrong; for if the people are as untractable as wolves, without a nobility, is it not prepoſterous for them to attempt to inſtitute a form of government, which in no inſtance recognizes that eſſential branch which is to preſerve the harmony of their ſocial compact?

If a nobility is alone to preſerve us, where in the name of common ſenſe are we to find our ſaviours: Are we to ſearch for them among the Eſſex junto, or are we to look for them among thoſe

who conſider the people as wolves? Born in a land ſettled by a fraternity of perſecuted republicans; living under a conſtitution and laws which embrace every citizen on the terms of equality, in what corner or hole of this extenſive territory are the people to look for help and aſſiſtance detached from themſelves? After experiencing the bleſſings of their *own protection*, from the firſt ſettlement of the country to the preſent hour, is it poſſible, that they ſhould now diſtruſt their own competency, irreverently denounce the guardianſhip of heaven, and throw themſelves into the arms of a nobility? We will not thus affront heaven—we will not thus diſhonour our forefathers—we will not thus entail miſery on our poſterity.

No. LXVIII.

THE NOBILITY IN A HOLE.

TEXT—"*The only way*, God knows, *is to put theſe Families* into a HOLE *by themſelves, and ſet two watches upon them: a* Superior *to them all, on one ſide, and the People on the other.*"

Mr. John Adams's Letter to Mr. Samuel Adams.

WHILE we read the political ſentiments of Mr. John Adams, it is natural to conſider them as the deliberate reflections of a civilian, who has long been in the ſtudy of government, and who has formed a ſyſtem, if not perfect, yet conſiſtent with his former avowed principles of republicaniſm. But it is difficult to bring *all* HIS doctrines to that point, by which we can draw a rational concluſion.

The ſtrength of his government conſiſts in political inſtitutions, which he ſays, "are *firſt produced*, and *conſtantly ſupported* and *improved* by a NOBILITY."—Theſe are the men to whom the people are to look for protection and happineſs. But after Mr. Adams had thus created his grand bulwark, and clothed his pre-eminent characters with the moſt extenſive powers, he ſeems to be *aſhamed*

of the work of his own hands—for, ſtrange to relate, this conſervative body are to be "put in a hole"; nay, he expreſſes it more fully, by calling "GOD" to witneſs, that the "only way is, to put them into a *hole by themſelves.*"

Fellow-citizens,—Fancy to yourſelves that the United States ſhould be under a government ſimilar to what is recommended by Mr. John Adams. In the firſt place, you muſt depreciate your own characters, by admitting yourſelves as incapable of governing without this nobility, as "WOLVES."—You muſt view yourſelves in poſſeſſion of all the ferocious, voracious and exterminating paſſions of this ſavage of the wilderneſs; you muſt view each other as a band of robbers, freebooters and ruffians; you muſt totally renounce every humane faculty of the ſoul; your fingers you muſt conſider as claws, your hands as fangs, your teeth as daggers, and the former harmony of your voice, when aſſembled to deliberate, as the terrific yells of the moſt ſanguinary beaſts of the foreſt. After you have thus brought yourſelves to this depth of degradation, you are to ſeek among a particular number of families, a body of men, on whoſe protection you are to rely, and who are to take you under their "*holy keeping.*" But the farce is not yet complete—for after you have clothed them with this extenſive power, and arrayed them in their gorgeous robes, you are to depoſit theſe highly reſpected dignitaries in a "HOLE," there to remain hidden from the public eye; and thus in *ſecret* to work out the ſalvation of the people. Surely there muſt be ſome magical operation to communicate theſe bleſſings, otherwiſe theſe *ſubterraneous conſervators* muſt be puzzled to diſtribute thoſe benefits, as they mature them within their *cells.*

I am not diſpoſed to treat the ſentiments of Mr. J. Adams with an indecent ſeverity, by diſtorting his propoſitions; but I am perſuaded, if ſuch a plan had been publiſhed in a newſpaper as a ſerious ſyſtem of government, and the name of the author was unknown, it would have excited univerſal deriſion.—For admitting Mr. Adams's premiſes to be right, that a nobility is neceſſary, and that they are to "produce, ſupport and improve the political inſtitutions," for the good of the people, yet nothing can be more unſeemly than putting ſuch a reſpectable body in a "*hole.*" If they are ſerviceable, why ſhould they be hid? Why ſhould they not be in a commanding ſituation to view the "whole ground"?

Why ſhould they be withdrawn from the view and inſpection of the people, while they were ſo aſſiduous to promote their welfare?

It may be conſidered a puerile play on words, in commenting ſo minutely on this expreſſion; but to uſe Mr. Adams's own words, "God knows" what he means by a HOLE, unleſs it is to place a body of men intirely out of the reach and ſovereignty of the people. It is true, he is for placing "two watches upon them; a ſuperior to them all, on one ſide, and the people on the other;" but here the ſyſtem claſhes, for if the people are as ungovernable as "wolves," without this nobility, there appears an abſurdity that they ſhould have any voice in checking them. If this nobility are ſo enlightened as to "*produce, ſupport*, and *improve* our political inſtitutions," and the people are ſo deſtitute of *ſelf-preſervation* as to be incapable of governing themſelves without them, it muſt certainly introduce a jargon in the ſyſtem, if they ſhould ultimately have authority to counteract thoſe eſtabliſhments which this well-informed body had ſanctioned.

The premiſes laid down by Mr. John Adams deſtroy his concluſions; for he places the people as deſtitute of natural propenſities to eſtabliſh political inſtitutions, while at the ſame time he makes them (in connexion with another unnamed power) the final compeers in the buſineſs. If they are not adequate to theſe purpoſes in the firſt inſtance, how do they become equal to the final deciſion? They remain "*wolves*" through the whole proceſs, as we cannot ſuppoſe this body, depoſited in a *hole*, can create in the people any new properties which they did not poſſeſs in their primary ſtate. This "modern philoſophy" is a compoſition of ſtrange, incoherent ingredients; the abſurdity is evident when we analyze it; and in order to ſhew the folly of ſuch a ſyſtem, let us ſee how far the doctrine would have held during our oppoſition to Britain.

Suppoſe Hutchinſon and Oliver had effected their purpoſes when they applied to the Britiſh miniſtry for a ſimilar mode of government? The nobility of that day were the families of Hutchinſon, Oliver, Vaſſals, &c. This nobility were to be placed in a ſituation ſomewhat ſimilar to Mr. Adams's "hole;" that is, in a place where the people could not come at them. Theſe 'well-born' individuals were to "*produce, ſupport* and *improve* the

political inſtitutions" of America. The "ſuperior" power, at that day, would have been the king of England. Under this organized ſyſtem, had the Congreſs of the United States aſſembled, and diſapproved of the meaſures of this king and nobility, the queſtion is, how far theſe two branches of the government would have "*ſupported* and *improved*" the meaſures of *John Hancock*, *Samuel Adams*, GEORGE WASHINGTON, THOMAS JEFFERSON, JOHN ADAMS, &c. who conſtituted the power which aroſe from the people? Rebels! Rebels! Wolves! Wolves! would have been echoed and re-echoed through the continent, and probably John Hancock and Samuel Adams would have been proſcribed as the moſt ferocious animals in the whole pack. Certainly Mr. John Adams would never have been elevated to the Chief Executive of the United States; he might have remained a pleader at the bar, but it is highly improbable he would have had the authority to appoint a whole bench of judges, or have placed himſelf in a ſituation to propoſe a form of government, which embraced the leading features of the Britiſh conſtitution. The king of England, and the nobility in the hole, would have controled all proceedings which led to our revolution; and provided Congreſs had had reſolution to raiſe an army, and appoint Waſhington as commander, even the Congreſs, army, and Waſhington, would have been conſigned, not merely to a "hole," but to the *bottomleſs pit*. Principles muſt be founded on facts.—Speculative whims are not required in this country; we have gone through a conteſt which fully explains all ſuch controverſial points—we know what a *king* is, we know what a nobility is, and we know what the people are; and I will venture to ſay, that nothing ſhort of the immediate interpoſition of heaven can maintain their rights, but *themſelves*, and the man is lunatic who ſays they are "their own worſt enemies." The enlightened ſtate of this country does not require men in a HOLE to govern them; the people are not only ſovereign by *inheritance*, but ſovereign from *information*.

Citizens of Maſſachuſetts!—Are you not competent to your political concerns? When ye meet as a legiſlature, do you require a body of nobility to make your laws, or to draft your reſolves? Are ye inadequate to vote ſalaries to your governour, judges, and others? Do ye require a body of nobility, with the extra compenſations for their titles, to carry on the meaſures of the

Commonwealth? Will the houſe of repreſentatives declare themſelves incapable to tranſact the buſineſs which annually comes before them, unleſs they have a body of nobility to produce and improve their civil inſtitutions?

Citizens of New-Hampſhire!—What ſay ye?—are ye willing to ſurrender your rights, and ſubmit your welfare to a body of men thus organized and authorized? Will ye truſt the ſalary of your governour, &c. to men in a HOLE?

Citizens of Connecticut!—What ſay ye?—does a nobility accord with your "ſteady habits"? Where are ye to ſelect your dignified order? Who among you have ſuperior knowledge to alter and improve your economical ſyſtem? In what HOLE in your State, can you depoſit a Connecticut nobility? Are Simſbury mines the place of refuge?

Citizens of Rhode-Iſland!—Come forward, and produce *your nobility*;—where are the highly favoured families, who have a claim on your gratitude, ſo far, as to ſurrender your privileges excluſively into their hands? We preſume there are none; we truſt that you have been, now are, and ever will be competent to regulate yourſelves. The ſteady habits of New-England riſe indignant at ſuch new-fangled doctrines, and we hope the enſuing election will convince the *advocates* for a nobility, that not even a *deſcendant* from them, muſt ever expect to receive the ſuffrages of independent electors? Let us convince the world, that Americans are not wolves, by ſupporting a government which is not accurſed with a nobility.

Citizens of the Northern States!—Let me aſk you, how far you can connect the politics of Waſhington with thoſe of Adams? The former never degraded the people with the appellation given them by the latter; Waſhington ever revered the people, and conſidered them capable of protecting themſelves; he never advocated the eſtabliſhment of a nobility to ſupport their rights; how then can we cry "WASHINGTON and ADAMS"? Let us not be deceived by names, but let us examine principles, and when we find that Mr. John Adams is derogating from the ſovereignty of the people, and is for placing a nobility above them, we cannot conſiſtently attach his name to that of Waſhington, who in every inſtance was oppoſed to ſuch pernicious doctrines. It is but of very little conſequence whether we formerly had a nobility palmed

upon us by the intrigue of Hutchinson, or it now should be effected by the plausibility of Adams. In either case, our ruin would be inevitable. The fact is, the plan proposed by Hutchinson and Oliver, to the British ministry, was in unison with that which Mr. John Adams advocates in his Letter to his friend. He, and he alone, who is in favour of a nobility, and who wishes to degrade the people, can subscribe to the political tenets of Mr. John Adams. Washington and Jefferson accord with more melody in the ears of republicans. Let us then be true to our principles, and not sacrifice them to pride, ostentation and folly.

No. LXIX.

ON PRESIDENT WASHINGTON'S PROCLAMATION OF NEUTRALITY.

PRESIDENT Washington's proclamation, on the principles of "*impartial neutrality*" agreeably to the "*modern* law of nations," was considered at the period of its promulgation so interesting to the commercial part of the United States, that a great majority of the seaports assembled to discuss the instrument. This town, in particular, expressed their sentiments on the subject. The word "*impartial*" was objected to by some, but the *confidence* placed in the determination of the executive, to support our commerce on the broad basis of the *modern* law of nations, even qualified this exceptionable expression.

I would here inquire, whether every man in the town-meeting did not consider his property then at sea, and all he should hereafter send, as completely guaranteed upon the principles of the proclamation? Did any merchant, at that time, (after the most solemn assurances of the President) conceive that his navigation was floating upon an *uncertainty* whether any measures would be adopted, by the federal government, to prevent the violation of that neutrality declared by the executive? Did any man indulge a suspicion,

that the Britiſh officers would be permitted to intercept our legal trade with the powers at war, while our cargoes conſiſted of ſuch articles as were expreſsly declared in the "*modern law*" as not ſubject to capture? Or could any citizen ſuppoſe, that our government would ſubmit to the arrogance of Britiſh ORDERS (iſſued immediately after the proclamation) to take all American veſſels bound to France, "*let their cargoes be what they may*"?

Impoſſible, that this ſhould be the idea of any man: but on the contrary, every one felt a *ſecurity* that the power, which had pledged itſelf upon the "*modern law*" of nations, would poſſeſs that national conſiſtency, as to defend the citizens againſt any wanton breaches of its fundamental principles. They certainly could not expect, that the authority which had promulgated the doctrine would ever relinquiſh it.

It may here be replied, that the Preſident *intended* to vindicate this right, but the *Britiſh nation* not having conſented to the *modern law* we were unavoidably expoſed to their depredations. But, if we examine the proclamation, we ſhall find, that the Preſident pledged our commerce even *againſt the Britiſh*; for, among the powers enumerated, "Great-Britain" is expreſsly mentioned. There was no exception to any of the belligerent powers; but the proclamation was a deciſive manifeſto to them *all*, that the commerce of the United States was guaranteed by the executive upon the *modern law* of nations. If Great-Britain was not conſidered as being *bound by it*, the wiſdom of the Preſident would naturally have led him to an explanation on this point; and unleſs he had intended to vindicate his proclamation againſt the depredations of this nation, his prudence would have cautioned him not to excite a falſe hope in the merchants that their property would be ſecured againſt them. The Preſident knew, that he had made a declaration of *his determination* to *all* the powers at war, and, as far as his proclamation went, he had taken a reſponſible part in the European controverſy. It was an EXECUTIVE PASSPORT, to all our merchants and ſeamen, proclaiming in the moſt explicit terms their ſecurity under it.

The proclamation was iſſued by the chief magiſtrate of an independent nation, and as ſuch, was a public, unequivocal manifeſtation of his diſpoſition. It was taking a ſide, as it reſpected the particular advantages to the United States, ariſing from the con-

vulſed ſtate of other nations. It was commencing a commercial war, in caſe *any power* attempted to violate it. To ſay, then, that *the Britiſh* were not bound by it, and that we muſt ſubmit to them, is no more than declaring, that the Preſident had made a proclamation which he had not fully conſidered; and that he had pledged himſelf to the belligerent powers to do that, which he could not maintain. In either caſe, the cenſure is too pungent on this ſuperior character, and thoſe who argue thus, reflect too ſeverely on his wiſdom, prudence, and foreſight.

The proclamation (if I may uſe the expreſſion) was *ſomething* or *nothing*. If it was *ſomething*, the ſubſtance of it ought to be retained: If it was *nothing*, the aſſembling of the merchants, to approbate the meaſure, was a "ſound, and nothing elſe."

As an individual, I expected, on the meeting of Congreſs, that this proclamation would have been the ground-work of all our political deciſions; that the *friends to the Preſident* would have nouriſhed the principles which it contained, and made them the polar ſtar of all their proceedings. But ſo far from this, theſe *nominal friends* to the Preſident conſidered it of little moment, and their ſpeeches, inſtead of advocating this official inſtrument, rather condemned it in every paragraph. The *modern law* of nations is ſcarcely mentioned by them; but attempts to palliate the Britiſh ſpoliations, on the *ancient law*, ſeemed to be the whole tendency of their arguments.

It is worthy of remark, that thoſe members in Congreſs, who were advocating a ſyſtem to give efficacy to the proclamation, were immediately denounced in certain papers as *enemies to the Preſident*; as attempting to drive this country into a war; as friends to anarchy, and enemies to the federal government:—whereas, the *proclamation* naturally led thoſe perſons into the meaſures they advocated, as being the only remedy *they* could adopt, to prevent the violation of the modern law. Mr. Madiſon contemplated the ſubject on this principle. He conſidered the ſtaple reſources of this country, adequate to all the important purpoſes of the proclamation. If the ground which the Preſident had taken was *tenable*, he was aſſiduous, as a member of the Legiſlature, to ſubſtantiate it by every poſſible exertion, and national effort. The more effectually to do this, he had recourſe to that impregnable fortreſs, the COMMERCE of the United States—a fortreſs which has ever been

conſidered as our STRONG HOLD, by all the writers on the Britiſh trade. His ſentiments are in uniſon with the patriots of the ſeveral ſtate conventions, and with the merchants of this town in 1786, as the ſpeeches and votes will fully teſtify. The ſame meaſures were advocated by Vice-Preſident ADAMS, while reſiding at the Britiſh court. This gentleman declared, at that period, that a ſyſtematic reſtriction on the Britiſh commerce would effect the higheſt advantages to this country. Mr. Dayton, and Mr. Clark, alſo enliſted in the controverſy, and commenced champions in defending the proclamation, by propoſing ſuch energetic meaſures as would place America in that forcible ſituation as to *command* indemnification. Theſe gentlemen knew that we had neither an army, nor a navy, to carry into operation the purpoſes of the executive, but that the "ſtrong arm of the Union" conſiſted principally in commercial exertions, and contending with Britain on the ground of mercantile retaliation.

By this repreſentation of the buſineſs, can the citizens heſitate who were the *real friends* to the Preſident? Whether the men who were ſupporting the meaſures of the Britiſh on the *ancient law*, or thoſe who were condemning them on the *modern?* Thoſe who were palliating the hoſtile proceedings of the Britiſh, while acting in direct oppoſition to the Preſident's proclamation, or thoſe who were attempting to counteract them? Thoſe who have advocated a treaty which has deſtroyed every principle of the proclamation, by annihilating the modern law, and reviving the ancient; which expoſes our commerce to capture, our ſeamen to impreſſment, and abandons the merchant to ſeek indemnification, *at his own coſt*, to the Britiſh courts; or thoſe who have uniformly endeavoured to vindicate our national rights, upon the moſt ſolemn pledge that could be given by the Preſident? On theſe queſtions, let the impartial citizens judge.

The concluſions from the above premiſes are, that the Preſident, in the plenitude of his patriotiſm, attempted to promote the commerce of the United States, upon the *modern law of nations*. His *nominal friends*, by their meaſures, defeated *his intentions*, by advocating the *ancient law*. His *real friends* endeavoured to ſupport him, by having recourſe to the commercial reſources of the country. They were alſo baffled in their exertions. The principles of the proclamation are totally deſtroyed by the treaty, and

the merchants are now *obliged* to look for indemnification to the Britiſh government, inſtead of holding to the Preſident's proclamation, on the *ſtability of which* they originally ventured their property.

COMMERCIAL COMPARISON BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

IN looking over the ſtatement of Mr. Tench Coxe, of the *exports* to the ſeveral nations of Europe, I find that the amount to the Britiſh is 9,218,540 dollars; and to the French, 12,653,635 dollars. As it reſpects the *amount* to the two nations, the French hold the advantage of about three millions. But it is obſerved on this ſtatement in the Centinel, "that theſe exports is a powerful proof of the bleſſings we have enjoyed from our neutrality, notwithſtanding the many ſpoliations on our commerce." I would aſk, how this is evident, as it relates to the *Britiſh?* We have exported upwards of nine millions to Britain, but by the ſtatements of the merchants, in their late repreſentation to Congreſs, the Britiſh have captured upwards of five millions. How then do the bleſſings appear on the ſide of Britain, when they have captured above one half of the amount of our exports? The principal controverſy on the ſubject of our commerce is, how far our "impartial neutrality" has been beneficial from the amity of the Britiſh? Their conduct is brought to a deciſive point, for we have the ſtatement of Mr. Coxe, as to the *exports*, and the repreſentation of the merchants as to the *captures*. The bleſſings are therefore known by deducting the latter from the former, and we find that the balance is againſt us.

Beſides, in the calculation of the bleſſings, we are to conſider the captures made ſince the ratification of the treaty, not only of our property, but of our ſeamen. In this eſtimate, therefore, we may fairly allow that the largeſt ſum exported to this amicably-diſpoſed nation has been captured.

To calculate the real bleſſings, we muſt take into conſideration our *imports*. Whether the imports from France have been more beneficial than from England, let us conſider the cargoes from the different powers. From France, we have received the principal part of our HARD MONEY. The banks have been moſtly ſupported by the depoſits from French voyages. The returns, from this quarter, have enriched the merchants and farmers. But I will defy any man to ſhow the advantages from the Engliſh importations; unleſs a cargo of their manufactures, conſiſting of every ſpecies of luxury, can be put in competition with SOLID COIN. The balance of trade with England is greatly againſt us. Millions of dollars are exported, by Mr. Jefferſon's report to Congreſs, to pay our arrearages, while our trade with France has enriched the country with an immenſe circulating medium. To ſet this buſineſs right, and that the people ſhould not be deceived by partial ſtatements, let Mr. Coxe give the imports from the ſeveral countries, and the *contents of the cargoes*, and we ſhall then be able to judge as to the benefits of our commerce.

A further conſideration is, that notwithſtanding the immenſe advantages to the Britiſh by the American commerce; notwithſtanding our declared neutrality, and the pains taken by our government to prevent every impoſition being practiſed on their trade, yet they have ſteadily purſued meaſures to injure us in every direction. Since the treaty was ſigned have they ſhewed us any particular favour? Has our commerce been more free from embarraſſments? Have they ſhowed the leaſt diſpoſition to convince the Americans of their friendſhip?

If we could obſerve the ſmalleſt evidence of Britiſh amity, we might conclude, that our conduct was the effect of political policy. But if we *muſt ſubmit*, upon the principles of Mr. Ames and Mr. Sedgwick, becauſe the Indian tomahawk will become the umpire of deciſion, we may go on, till every trait of our national character is obliterated. Let us at leaſt take ſome political poſition, otherways the Britiſh will inevitably reduce this country, to the humiliating ſituation of colonies. The ſpeeches of the foregoing gentlemen, lead us to this point, and the diſpoſition of the Britiſh is ſuch, as will puſh them to the accompliſhment of this object. Theſe ſpeeches are but little ſhort of a declaration of the ſurrender

of our ſovereignty and independence, and that we muſt hereafter depend on the mercy of that nation, for the ſupport of every bleſſing acquired by our revolution.

No. LXX.*

CLERICAL ADDRESS TO PRESIDENT ADAMS.

To Mr. David Oſgood, Moderator, and Mr. Jedidiah Morſe, Scribe, of the Convention of Miniſters.

"AS MINISTERS OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE," the addreſs of the *Congregatisnal Clergy* to Preſident Adams claims the particular attention of your fellow-citizens.

The political ſituation of this country in connexion with the republic of France, calls on thoſe who profeſs to be actuated by the benevolent ſpirit of religion, to expreſs their ſentiments with that *moderation*, as will convince the *world* that *party zeal* forms no part of their chriſtian character. Candour and benevolence are traits more congenial with the religion you profeſs, than invective and indiſcriminate cenſure.

"As miniſters of peace, aſſembled in annual convention," (to adjuſt no doubt your particular profeſſional concerns) what could lead you to paſs your anathemas on the citizens of France, as "atheiſtical, licentious, and diſorganizing"? As having "produced the greateſt crimes and miſeries, in their own country, and diffuſing their baneful influence even to diſtant nations"?

Indiſcriminate charges ill become men of your ſtation in ſociety. I would requeſt you, gentlemen, to reflect on the ſtate of religion in France, previous to the revolution: and then you will be able to judge, how far the ſtate of the chriſtian ſyſtem is changed from that *purity* which it formed under the monarchy. It cannot be ſuppoſed, that you will pretend to advocate the principles on which religion was *then* founded; when the mind was fet-

---

* *This, and the foregoing Number, were not originally publiſhed under the ſignature of Old-South.*

tered with all the abominable tenets and dogmas of the popiſh hierarchy; when the deluded citizens were bound to ſubmit to the *infallibility of prieſts*; and when thouſands were immured in convents, to groan under the tortures and impoſitions inflicted on them by a herd of rapacious monks, and voratious friars. Was the ſtate of religion in France, of that *evangelical nature*, and ſo conſonant to the dictates of the Chriſtian ſyſtem, that you now deplore the change? Do you feel afflicted that the Supreme Being has overthrown an eccleſiaſtical tyranny, which for ages has been conſidered as a ſcourge to the church of Chriſt? whoſe maſſacres and crimes have rendered the page of hiſtory a ſcene too abhorrent and ſanguinary for the human mind to contemplate? Can you arraign the wiſdom of heaven in thus deſtroying that *man of ſin*, whom God himſelf had declared ſhould be thrown into perdition? or do you ſympathize with *his holineſs*, that the predictions of the goſpel have been verified in his downfal? Surely, gentlemen, if you make the bible your ſtudy, or if you believe in the prophets, your pious reflections would carry you to adore the juſtneſs of the Supreme Being, in theſe important events, rather than to vent your reſentment againſt *theſe inſtruments* which he has been pleaſed to employ.

But, gentlemen, you ſay, they are *now deiſtical*: You appear concerned that the work is not done *to your approbation*. In this particular, however, you have aſſumed an inquiſitorial authority, unbecoming your characters, either as *American citizens*, or Chriſtians.—As Americans, what right have you to interfere in their religious eſtabliſhments? While you are peaceably worſhipping in your own pariſhes, what have you to do with the religion of France? No French prieſts moleſt your devotions; why then do you iſſue your bulls againſt them? No convention in France, at their annual meeting, have charged you with being diſorganizers, or deſtroyers of ſocial order; why then ſhould you place yourſelves as arbiters of their Chriſtian concerns?

The fact is, gentlemen, the religion of France is eſtabliſhed on the broad baſis of catholiciſm, which admits every man to worſhip God, according to the dictates of his conſcience. They have emancipated the human mind from that thraldom, with which domineering prieſts have for centuries fettered it. Each citizen judges for himſelf, on his eternal concerns, and is now left to

pay his adoration to Deity, undeterred from the reſentment of an arbitrary prieſthood. The various ſects of profeſſionaliſts purſue unmoleſted their religious devotions, and every man (let his religion be what it may) can attend a place of worſhip with equal ſecurity and protection as in any town or city in the United States.

That ſome philoſophers in France are deiſts, is not denied. But, gentlemen, where are not theſe characters to be found? In England, and in America, we find men of this principle. Great ſtateſmen, and men of benevolent minds, have been philoſophers of this deſcription. But your candour, it is preſumed, will not condemn either England or America, becauſe ſome men of this profeſſion have differed from you on this ſpeculative point.

You have, gentlemen, been miſled as to the principles of the French government, in matters of religion. The Britiſh papers have chiefly been the medium of our intelligence, on this ſubject. They have pictured the deiſtical ſtate of France, juſt to ſuit their particular purpoſes; and under cover of theſe deceptions, they have attempted to raiſe the prejudices of their own ſubjects, and the deteſtation of the American citizens, againſt the nation. But let an impartial man read the *hiſtory of England*, during their wars: The horrid devaſtations they have ſpread in all thoſe countries they have conquered: *The perſecutions of the clergy of your order, even in England:* The martyrs who have fell a ſacrifice to the ſanguinary edicts of their government: The deſtruction which their armies ſpread in America, and which was peculiarly aimed at the *houſes of worſhip*. Charleſtown can teſtify to their conflagrations, and the citizens of Boſton have witneſſed their ſacrilegious proſtitution of our religious temples. Your abhorrence, then, ought not to be confined to France, and your cenſures ſhould not be particularly aimed to defame this nation, in excluſion of Britain.

If, in your zeal, you are deploring the ſtate of religion, or if your convention aſſembled with "fervent wiſhes and prayers for the *univerſal extenſion of national liberty*, ſocial order, and chriſtian piety," why were you wholly confined to vent your invectives againſt France? If *univerſal extenſion of national liberty* was your fervent wiſh, why are you ſilent while you hear the groans of the afflicted Iriſh? Their murders, ravages, and deſolation, cry

aloud to the God of Sabaoth ; and, as his vicegerents, deploring the unhappy ſtate of mankind, your prayers ought to accompany their agonizing complaints.

You, gentlemen, in particular, were advocates for the Britiſh treaty ; but, if *religion is the ſubject of controverſy*, how could you be ſo deſirous to commence a connexion with that nation whoſe vindictive rage firſt drove our forefathers to the wilderneſs of America ; and, from that period, has been aſſiduous to eſtabliſh an hierarchy to undermine thoſe *congregational eſtabliſhments* on which yours are founded ? Has Bonaparte, like archbiſhop Laud, and other eccleſiaſtics, in his addreſſes to the clergy, ſpoke the language of a ruffian ? Has not the former, rather preached to them of righteouſneſs, charity, and benevolence ? Has he not told them to follow the precepts of the Maſter whom they preſume to imitate ? In what page of the Engliſh hiſtory can you find the *conqueror* thus exhorting the *conquered* to acts of kindneſs, patriotiſm, and philanthropy ?

But, gentlemen, it may be ſaid, that, *as a government*, the French have reprobated the principles of religion. This certainly does not appear, while they tolerate religion of every deſcription. The Jews, and the various orders of devotees, have perfect liberty in France to purſue their reſpective modes of worſhip. The French, in their conſtitution, allow the ſuperintendance of the Supreme Being. It is thus introduced : " The French people proclaim, in the preſence of the SUPREME BEING." This is more than is acknowledged by the federal conſtitution. The conſtitution of the United States begins with " We the people." No mention is made of the Supreme Being, nor no acknowledgment of his government, direction, or bleſſing. It would be judging hardly of the citizens of the United States, if any power in Europe, on this account, ſhould object to an alliance with us, as *atheiſts*. The Dey of Algiers inquired of our miniſter, whether we were *Chriſtians* ; and his anſwer was, that the conſtitution made no diſtinction between Chriſtians and Mahometans. The Dey was pleaſed with the idea, and eſteemed our connexion the more valuable on that account.

The deſultory converſation in the French convention, on religion, no doubt, produced many ſpeculative opinions : and if a debate in our Congreſs, on this ſubject, ſhould take place, it is proba-

ble ſome deiſtical opinions would be broached by certain high federaliſts. But would it be candid for the clergy of England to reprobate the Americans as deiſts, for the imprudencies of a few individuals in Congreſs? Or would it be right in them to ſuppoſe, that a *general decay* of religion had prevailed in America, and that we were all turned deiſts, becauſe a particular body of the clergy, "in and about Cambridge," had publiſhed an addreſs, repreſenting a general *non-attendance* on public worſhip? An addreſs of this kind was publiſhed in our public papers, about a year ſince; but no king, potentate, prieſt, or prelate in Europe has anathematized America on this account, nor thought it of importance to iſſue their bulls againſt that fountain of ſcience, (Cambridge) from whence have iſſued ſo many ſtreams to make glad the city of our God.

The French, it is true, have no eccleſiaſtical titles, as Right Reverend Father in God, His Holineſs, or Reverend. Theſe form no part of the religious vocabulary. Neither Aaron, the prophets, apoſtles, nor evangeliſts, arrogated to themſelves theſe attributes; and it is a ſerious conſideration, whether the clergy, who have ſince aſſumed theſe appellations, will not have to anſwer for their preſumption to a *jealous God*, on the great day of retribution! "Holy and *Reverend* is HIS NAME."

I ſhall conclude, gentlemen, this lengthy addreſs with my fervent prayers and wiſhes, that you would attend to that important Work for which you are ordained: To be leſs attentive to the amuſements, recreations, and politics, of this world: To endeavour to ſoothe the paſſions, rather than to inflame them. For "as *miniſters of peace*" it becomes you, *at your annual convention*, to ſtudy thoſe things that lead to reconciliation, rather than to urge the people by *partial repreſentations* into a war.

No. LXXI.

TO THEOPHILUS PARSONS, ESQ.

As you have withdrawn the *plea*, which you solemnly pledged yourself to the court to argue, the public are not furnished with the documents on which you predicated your appeal. As you have thus left the question in this crude state, there is nothing remaining on which to animadvert, but the *impropriety* of your conduct.

A gentleman so long in the practice of the law, it is presumed, is well acquainted with the importance of the judiciary branch of government. In this department are suspended the lives, liberty and property of the citizens. Public confidence therefore is essential to its administration, and every wanton attempt to derogate from its respectability, must be acknowledged as highly reprehensible.

When the judges assemble, impannel the jury, and the crier announces the organization of the court, it is taken for granted that the *jurisdiction* is authorized by the constitution. At this period, if an individual should arrest the proceedings, by a plea which strikes at its existence, it is an act of assumption which demands the highest authority for his conduct. The judiciary, thus moving in a legal and formal direction, is as sacred as the ark of old; and if any man attempts to impede its progress, he is as amenable to the laws of society, as the disturber of the ancient building to the penal sanction of the Supreme Being. As citizens, we have a right to inquire, by what authority any part of the business of the present court was suspended by your interference?

It is understood, sir, that your plea involved in it, not merely the jurisdiction of the court on a particular action, but struck at the foundation on which the judiciary superstructure was raised. The judges, with the utmost condescension, referred your question to be argued at 10 o'clock on the next day. In the interim the

court was adjourned, and certain actions were suspended till you had offered the arguments in support of your allegation.

During this intermission, the public mind was agitated; the courts of law were considered as palsied; the actions depending were hung up as doubtful in their issue; the jury were retarded in the accomplishment of their business; in short, the laws of the country, for twenty-four hours, if not annihilated, were judged by many as progressing to a dissolution.

The hour arrived, sir, in which this interesting question was to be argued. The court assembled, and sat in solemn suspense, whether they were, or were not a constitutional jurisdiction, competent to the purposes of trying *all causes* which were presented on the docket. At this awful crisis, it was announced, that you had waved the consideration of the question, which the day before you had pledged yourself to urge—or, in plain English, that *Theophilus Parsons, Esquire,* had *permitted* the court of justice to proceed on business without any further interruption!

An individual thus to trifle with a court of justice, is an indecency, in my opinion, of the greatest magnitude. If, sir, you had previously weighed the subject, (which undoubtedly it was your duty to do) why did you not appear at the hour assigned, and offer your reasons in support of your plea? Why did you not decently come forward, and beg pardon for your temerity, or boldly maintain the controversy? Is there not a respect due to the judiciary, when a *lawyer* presumes to challenge its jurisdiction? or ought he thus sport with the court by evading the question? Are the public to depend on the flexibility of your nerves, or do you consider yourself as the *pivot* on which the tribunals of our government are to turn? Do you assume an *exclusive* jurisdiction to stop courts, or set them in motion at your pleasure? Are you the organ of a disaffected party to convulse the United States, on the subject of the judiciary, or have you a conservative power to control the national government? How can you answer for the suspension of the powers of this court, while you have no other apology for your conduct, than the sovereignty of your own will, by which you checked its legal progress? Can you compensate for the inconveniences attending such suspension, to those whose causes were involved in the decision? Answer, sir, as a citizen and a lawyer.

A particular body of men, of late have placed themselves in an attitude which appears calculated to *stop the wheels of government.* They assume an arrogance of deportment to which no free government ought to submit; they seem to sport with the constituted authorities, and the laws of Congress are treated by them with the utmost disrespect. The executive in particular is abused with the grossest calumny; every officer of government, sanctioned by the President, is the immediate object of scurrility and defamation; no man, but whom the junto approve, escapes with impunity. They appear to arrogate legislative, executive and judiciary authority; the acts of the legislature are denounced, if they are not agreeable to their principles; all measures of the President are anathematized if they do not conform to their wishes, and even justice is shaken in its seat, unless the scales are held in a direction graduated by them.

If, sir, you mean to take a bold stand, come forward in a character equal to the magnitude of the subject, and mark precisely your lines of entrenchment; do not sport upon visionary motions and pleas, on which you are cautious of risking a *personal responsibility*; do not trifle with courts of justice, but if you are sincere in your opposition, substantiate your objections by arguments addressed to the understanding, rather than by suggestions which you are unwilling to avow before a tribunal proper to try their merits.

As you have been indulged by the judges to offer your plea, in "*oppugnation*" to a jurisdiction, which *they had legalized* by all the usual forms attending our courts of judicature, it is expected, after you have thus abruptly abandoned the ground, that this authority will not suffer itself to be retarded by any further proceedings of a similar nature. They will not hazard the tranquillity of the country to gratify the resentment of a few disappointed partizans.

After your formal parade in offering your plea and exciting the attention of the public, to stumble at the threshold, and shrink from the arduous undertaking, must lessen you in the estimation even of those who have heretofore appreciated your talents. The palladium of justice is not to be violated by rushing precipitately into its sanctuary, and in a wanton manner to prostrate its attri-

butes. When a man contemplates so important a transaction, it is incumbent on him to pause and deliberate with the most solemn circumspection, before he ventures even to suggest his intentions; he should reflect on the consequences before he agitates the question, and not afterwards become terrified at the magnitude and danger of his propositions.

I will venture to inquire of you, sir, if such a procedure, (analagous in all its points) had taken place in England, whether it would have passed over without a severe reprimand from the bench? The prudence and moderation of the judges, in the present state of politics, it is candidly supposed was the only cause which prevented a similar reprehension. I am not for abridging the privileges of the citizens in their appeals to the judiciary, but I must repeat, that when a man enters the sanctum sanctorum of justice, with a solemn remonstrance against its jurisdiction, it is incumbent on him to consider maturely the ground of his objections, and the *consequences arising from them*, before he ventures to disturb the harmony of the system. It is but a poor apology, sir, that you reflected afterwards more seriously on the subject, as the time to consider the plea was of much longer duration previous to your entering it, than the hour assigned to argue it. I am willing to admit your apology, but must hold to my first position, that your conduct was *indiscreet* and *indecent*. You may think, sir, to evade an answer with as much indifference as you abandoned *your plea*, but depend on it your *over-rated* talents will not screen you from further animadversions.

No. LXXII.

TO THEOPHILUS PARSONS, ESQ.

THE mortification which you have suffered, in not being able to support your plea, may be an apology for not noticing the remarks made in my last Number. This, however, is but a feeble

excuse for a man, who has ventured to arrest a Court of Justice in its legal operations. If you do not answer, your cause goes by *default*; and you stand convicted, before an impartial public, of attempting that which you could not substantiate, and of retreating from a controversy on which your professional talents were pledged.

Your reputation, as a lawyer, had arisen to the highest elevation; but "there is a tide in the affairs of men." You have been suffered to sport with the character you had acquired, and have at length by your temerity brought yourself to that standard, which is the only "check and balance" to an unbounded vanity and ambition. You vainly thought that your plea was sufficient to convince the people of the unconstitutionality of the court, without reflecting that it would excite on the next day, the curiosity of a crouded audience, to hear the arguments urged in defence of the ground which you had presumptuously occupied. Your nerves, it is probable, were strung at the moment of your appeal, to an uncommon tone of energy; but a few hours of more deliberate reflection had relaxed them to that state of debility, which palsied those efforts adequate to the magnitude of the undertaking.

I would wish, sir, to reason coolly on this interesting subject. I would ask you, whether your plea was not a direct impeachment either of the integrity or legal knowledge of the judges? The court was opened and formally organized; prayers were made to heaven to solemnize its proceedings; the marshal, constables, and every subordinate officer, were pursuing their usual rotine of business:—Was it not then the highest act of impropriety to state a plea which struck at the constituted authority of the United States, thus solemnly and formally moving within its judiciary orbit?—What was the language of your plea? Was it not to this purport? 'May it please your Honours, *I, Theophilus Parsons*, come forward, clothed with the majesty of my own pre-eminence, to inform the court, that they do not know the duties of their office; although they have taken an oath to support the constitution of the United States, yet they are acting in violation of it; that they are pursuing measures which expose them to an impeachment; that they are ignorant of the laws which they presume to execute; that the prayer of the clergyman on opening the court, is a libel against the government, and an affront to heaven; that the jury are only

aiders and abettors of treason and rebellion; and, that your marshal and constables are in league with a body of insurgents, who have assembled in this hallowed place of justice to prostrate all the sacred attributes of the judiciary—I, therefore propose, at 10 o'clock to-morrow, to convince your Honours of the legality of my charge; and, if you are honest men, you will dissolve the court, and retire to your homes, under a full conviction of the indecency and impropriety of your conduct!'

This, sir, appears to me to be the plain language of your plea; and after you had thus come forward, I must declare as my opinion, that the court *ought* to have held you to prove your charge, or obliged you to *ask pardon* for your presumption.

I would ask you, sir, whether you had fully considered the *consequences* of your conduct?---Suppose a vessel had sailed for Europe on the day you offered your plea, and it was announced in England, France, Holland, Russia, and other commercial nations, that the courts of justice were about to be stopped in America—do you know, sir, what effect this might have had on the commerce of this country? Would an English, Dutch or Russian merchant ship goods, while the courts of law were thus suspended? Would not every European merchant have been cautious how far he answered the orders of his correspondents? Would not a general distrust have arisen on the Exchange of these respective nations? Would not an universal dread have been stamped on all mercantile concerns, as they related to the United States? especially, if it was asserted that the *giant of the law* had thus arrested the courts of justice, and had only required a few hours to complete the dissolution? Thus the strength of your talents proves the weakness of your conduct.

As a lawyer, you may think to trifle *within the bar*, but remember, sir, that what is sport to you, is death to the character of the country. The property of the merchant, in his foreign connexions, is of the most sacred nature. You ought also to be reminded, that the commerce of America is deposited in almost every port of the habitable world, and that your *visionary speculations* may eventually ruin thousands of enterprising merchants and industrious seamen. I am free to say, that I think every man who was concerned in navigation, and whose vessel sailed on the day in which you stopped the Court, is entitled to an action of damage,

for your wanton, injudicious, and unprecedented proceedings, and if I was on the jury, ſhould inſiſt on laying a heavy penalty.

Further—did you conſider how far ſuch a proceeding might have operated on the *public credit* of the United States? The nations, to whom we are indebted, might have made immediate demands on us, when they apprehended a diſſolution of our Judiciary. The public funds muſt have fallen in foreign markets, and the merchants in general been expoſed to all thoſe inconveniences ariſing from a *decreaſe of confidence* in our judiciary tribunals. In ſhort, ſir, you are not aware of the miſchiefs which might have taken place by your indiſcretion, not only as it relates to individuals, but to the whole nation. I am willing to allow you every indulgence for your haſty meaſure, but while the dignity and reputation of America are hazarded by your imprudence, it is incumbent on every citizen to reprobate your folly.

I would call on you, ſir, to produce an authority, on which you predicated your plea. I do not pretend to be a *drilled lawyer*, ſhackled with the *formalites* of his profeſſion, but I challenge you to ſtate from the books a ſimilar plea. I know that a plea of juriſdiction may be made, as to a particular caſe, but you will be puzzled to ſhew any authority analogous to your imperious ſtride of deſtroying the exiſtence of a court, in the extenſive degree contemplated by you. As an attorney, I aſk you to produce the evidence ----you may be ſilent, but ſilence is no conviction of the propriety of your behaviour; and when a *lawyer* holds his tongue, it is a ſtrong proof that he is *confounded*. If you do not anſwer, I muſt conclude that *Theophilus Parſons, Eſquire*, is deſtitute of *reaſons* to vindicate his conduct.

I would not be too ſevere in my remarks, or attempt to draw an unfair concluſion from the premiſes; but when we conſider the *revolutionary tendency* of the meaſure; the conſequences which muſt inevitably have taken place, in caſe the plea had been admitted; the total derangement of all cauſes in which property was depending; the general convulſion in every department of government, by a war commencing between the legiſlature and judiciary; in ſhort, the laws ſuſpended; life, liberty and property toſſed on the boiſterous ocean of contending parties; the ſword of juſtice arreſted, and the poignard of an Eſſex junto introduced as a ſubſtitute—amidſt this contention, who, ſir, could anſwer for the dreadful ſtate

into which ſociety would be plunged? *You* muſt have been reſponſible for the event, and "God only knows" the extent of the cataſtrophe. Viewing things on this broad ſcale, no citizen who duly eſtimates the harmony of the United States will conſider the above obſervations as too pungent. I flatter myſelf that your candour and good ſenſe will ſuppoſe them but a *moderate diſcipline* for the evil which you threatened.

No. LXXIII.

BILLY DAPPER AND CHARLES STEADY.

IN the progreſs of *federaliſm*, every *paſſion* of the human mind has been aſſailed; intereſt, fear and pride have been the bulwarks more immediately expoſed to the attack of the enemy. The *young men* of all ranks in ſociety have been arreſted by the federal party; the weight of pecuniary influence has threatened them with poverty, and in many inſtances with the ruin of themſelves and families. How often have we ſeen the overbearing ſpirit of a rich deſpot, exerciſed on the days of election—and it is known as a fact, that many *tradeſmen* were explicitly told, at the time the *Britiſh treaty* was in agitation, if they did not ſign in favour of its adoption, that every means would be taken to deprive them of the employment of *federaliſts*. Even ſince the *laſt election*, certain *petty tyrants* have refuſed to employ ſome *independent mechanics*, becauſe they exerciſed their right of ſuffrage as *conſcience* dictated, when they had ever fulfilled their engagements with undoubted honeſty and fidelity.

But the moſt powerful and artful method purſued was exciting a kind of *faſhionable currency* to the politics of the day. Thoſe who preſumptuouſly ſtyled themſelves the "better ſort" introduced a cant phraſeology of *federal* and *jacobin*. *Federaliſm* was as faſhionable as a *ſpencer* or *pantaloons*—in all thoſe *refined circles*, federaliſm was the card of invitation or introduction;

which admitted the reſpective gueſts—" Mr. Such-a-one, *a federaliſt*," was the common paſſport which uſhered him into theſe polite aſſociations. Maſters and miſſes were taught to reverence and reſpect all thoſe who were complimented with this appellation; young *gentlemen* and young *ladies* were noticed by their reſpective mammas and papas in proportion as they gave evidences of their *federal inclination*.

Billy Dapper was a federaliſt, and *Charles Steady* a jacobin; the former was received with every mark of cordiality, while the latter was reprobated as the moſt abandoned profligate. *Billy* would talk with a peculiar flippancy about politics, and lament the progreſs of infidelity; he would repeat with rapid volubility, *d—n the jacobins, d—n the diſorganizers, d—n the deiſts, d—n a republican government*, and generally concluded his *pious* rhapſody with *d—n Tom Paine!* He was a prodigy of perfection, and every thing *Billy* ſaid was conſidered *monſtrouſly* wiſe and *wonderfully* profound; he gained ſuch an aſcendancy that all he propoſed was adopted, and many deep ſpeculations were made in conſequence of his ſage recommendations. His notes were readily endorſed, and Billy had only to aſk and receive; he purſued his plans, and increaſed in reputation to the amount of about 100,000 dollars. At length his affairs began to grow a " little ſqually;" his " checks" on the bank were all " balanced;" and finally he had no other reſource than to betake himſelf to the *place of refuge* in " Scollay's buildings," and there, like many of his predeceſſors, enriched himſelf by impoveriſhing his creditors; thereby cancelling all debts, dues and demands by a *noli proſequi* of " *ſit tranſit gloria mundi.*" *Billy Dapper* after thus *legally* and *honourably* diſincumbering himſelf from the rude aſſaults of impertinent *dunners* and more inſolent *bailiffs*, ſtrutted about with a dignified deportment; took new apartments, decorated them with faſhionable furniture, and commenced *gentleman* under the " modern philoſophy" of the bankrupt-act. He now renews his old language; *d—ns the jacobins, d—ns the preſident*, and is peculiarly energetic in anathematizing *Tom Paine the infidel*. He is greatly concerned for the cauſe of religion, and laments the conſequences of demoralizing the riſing generation; he will often exclaim,—what will become of ſociety when men are not held to do juſtice by *moral obligation!* But Billy is a federaliſt; he has aſſumed his credit, goes on in his buſineſs, and even now looks

down with ineffable contempt on *Charles Steady*.—During the *reign of terror*, Billy and his comrades were outrageous againſt every man who dared to think different from them; the card-table would ſometimes be diſturbed by their vociferations; even the tranquil game of whiſt would be thrown into confuſion; all the *honours* would oftentimes be loſt, and the *tricks* would be the only part of the game to count upon.

Thus much for the hiſtory of *Billy Dapper*—but, alas, *Charles Steady* was peculiarly unfortunate under his political denunciation. He had received a collegiate education, and was well inſtructed in the principles of honeſty and economy; he had not only applied himſelf to his profeſſion, but had appropriated his leiſure hours to reading hiſtory, and from thence had been able to judge with propriety of thoſe ſyſtems of government which ſecured the rights of the people; he knew the baneful effects of monarchy, the deſtructive tendency of ariſtocracy, and had from reflection approved a republican form as moſt congenial to his country. Knowing that economy was the baſis of this government, he always reprobated thoſe expenditures and eſtabliſhments under the former adminiſtration, which led to a ſubverſion of the purity of its principles. In the reign of terror, therefore, he had the reſolution not to wear a *cockade;* he exploded the idea of a ſtanding army; he did not approve of exciſe laws or ſtamp-acts, and thought it was an impoſition for Mr. Adams to allow eight per cent. for the loan of money when all the federaliſts had pledged their lives and *property* in ſupport of his meaſures. He would often ſay, why did Mr. Adams thus ſport away the public credit in giving ſuch exceſſive uſury, when he had the ſtrongeſt aſſurances from the addreſſes of the federaliſts, that their property was at his diſpoſal? *Charles*, by this kind of converſation, and by adhering to theſe principles, was early denounced in all circles of his acquaintance as a *jacobin;* the young *gentlemen* forſook him, the young *ladies* eyed him aſkant; even when he entered into company, it was quickly whiſpered that he was a *jacobin;* if any parties were propoſed in his preſence, it was ſoon huſhed till *Charles* had retired—No *gentleman* would be ſeen abroad in his company; no *lady* would condeſcend to *ride with him*, none to walk with him, none to talk with him, none to *curteſy* to him, even if he ſubmiſſively bowed to them;—alas, poor Charles was forſaken by all his former acquaintance; and even

the young *ladies* who always before were pleaſed with him, took a ſtrong averſion, and he was left alone to wander about like Rachel mourning for her firſt-born.

However, *Charles* adhered to his principles, and purſued his occupation with induſtry. He got forward in oppoſition to the vile means of his enemies to injure his reputation; he formed a character by his ſcientific acquirements; his credit was eſtabliſhed by the rectitude of his conduct; his notes were never hawked upon the exchange at a diſcount; he baffled his opponents by the uniformity of his principles, and now ſtands in that elevated ſituation, as it relates to property and honour, that his enemies envy him. He is not diſturbed by the cries of the injured widow and orphans; he walks through the ſtreets without the curſes of honeſt creditors; and when he paſſes, no man can ſay, *there goes a villain!* He does not carry the bankrupt-act as a paſſport, or a "WHEREAS" as a receipt in full for all delinquencies; his payments are twenty ſhillings in the pound, and what he eats, drinks and wears are not the earnings of other men's induſtry. He does not make religion a cloak for licentiouſneſs, or curſe Tom Paine for a maſk to cheat an indiſcreet tradeſman; he eſteems honeſt men, let their religious profeſſions be what they may, and never embraces a hypocrite to gain an advantage by his ſycophancy; he ſpeaks his mind on all proper occaſions with the ſincerity of a freeman, and ſcorns to flatter, though he might obtain the approbation of the powerful; he remains collected in the various changes of parties, and ſteady to his purpoſe when he is threatened with the frowns of the opulent; an approving conſcience raiſes him above fear, and all his actions are the reſult of a deliberation, founded on the baſis of inviolable integrity. He never ſmiles to betray the innocent, or frowns to diſmay the timid; he inculcates Chriſtianity to promote charity and philanthropy, but deſpiſes the man who makes the benevolence of the Deity a ſcourge to inflict the miſchief rankling within his own boſom; his practice and his profeſſion in every reſpect correſpond; he is not a ſaint in words, and a fiend in deeds.

Thus ſtand in general the characters of theſe two men, and thus have they proceeded in their reſpective intercourſe with ſociety. To avoid as much as poſſible, perſonalities, they are not ſo

particularly described as to designate any individual. One, however, has been covered with the mantle of *federalism*, which, like charity, hides a multitude of sins; while the other has been obliged to exercise all his virtues, to screen himself from the malignant disposition of his adversaries—while one revelled in luxury and dissipation, imposed on the credulous and defrauded the unsuspicious, the other was beset with all the venom of malice, and his character rendered the sport of every unprincipled man who had enrolled his name in the federal catalogue. "Such things have been," but we trust in God that the time is arrived, when characters will be estimated, not by the phraseology of party, but by the standard of honour and honesty; that imperious lordlings who have acquired fortunes by the necromancy of speculation; despots who exercise an insolent control over the tradesmen and labourer; and fanatics who wish to shackle the reason of mankind, will be brought to that 'check and balance' which gives them no other pre-eminence than what arises from their inherent merit. When this takes place, the hypocrite will be stripped of his plumage, the purse-proud speculator of his trappings, and spurious federalism appear in that deformity to which its advocates have long since reduced it.

No. LXXIV.

THE WIDOW'S MITE.

TEXT—"*And he called unto him his disciples, and sayeth, verily I say unto you, that this poor* Widow *hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the Treasury.*—Mark xi. 43d.

THE scripture is profitable for all things; it contains doctrines which are applicable both to civil and religious institutions. Our Saviour took cognizance of all transactions, and always made his observations with a view to inculcate social and divine precepts.

After cautioning his hearers againſt thoſe "who love to go in long clothing, and ſalutations in the market-place, the chief ſeats in the ſynagogue, the uppermoſt ſeats at feaſts; who devoured widows' houſes, and for a pretence made long prayers:" At this moment of exhortation, he ſat over againſt the Treaſury, and beheld many that "were rich caſt in much"; but amidſt this general exhibition of public munificence, he deſcried a poor woman putting in her mite, which ſo far arreſted his attention as immediately led him to notice the promptitude with which ſhe paid her exactions.

This caſting into the treaſury, it is conjectured, was a tax upon the Jews, for the ſupport of their eccleſiaſtical inſtitutions; as we cannot ſuppoſe that either the rich or the poor were at that day diſpoſing of their money in a wanton manner, without ſome call from the government. The rich Scribes and Phariſees, it is probable, took occaſion in the preſence of our Saviour, to ſhew their alacrity in paying tythes of all they poſſeſſed, and depoſited of their abundance, the full amount of their taxes. They thought it would confound him, while reprobating thoſe who made a boaſt of their ſanctity, to ſee with what readineſs they placed their aſſeſſed quota into the treaſury. It is probable, they expected the multitude and his diſciples would have roſe in oppoſition to his denunciation, when the evidence was ſo clearly before their eyes, of the ſincerity of their profeſſions. No doubt ſome men in long clothing, who had devoured many a widow's houſe, took occaſion to make a great parade around the treaſurer's office, in order to attract the attention of the bye-ſtanders—they expected to hear the people cry out, theſe are the "men of order"! theſe are the men of "ſteady habits"! theſe are thoſe who ſupport church and ſtate! theſe are the charitable actions of thoſe whom ye have thus calumniated! Behold their ſincerity! ſee with what cheerfulneſs they caſt in their riches! Can any doubt their attachment to the rights, liberties and happineſs of the people? As to this poor widow, ſhe only caſts in a mite, while they are obliged to enrich the treaſury with the greateſt abundance.

This mode of reaſoning was very natural for men who conſidered things in this contracted point of view; but our Saviour reflected on this event in a different manner. He never made an obſervation without an explicit meaning; he conſidered the ſubject, as it related to the circumſtances of ſociety, and the *inequality*

of taxes. He knew that the abundance of the rich was not in proportion to the widow's mite; and when he saw that her tax was the greatest part of her whole property, he could not but remark to his disciples on the disproportion of the burthen. His whole ministration was solely calculated to relieve the bowed down, and when he observed in this general deposit into the treasury, that though the rich seemed to bear a large proportion of the public expenses, yet as it related to the property possessed, the poor had the heaviest weight in discharging the public debt. The treasurer, it is expected, even smiled at the poor widow, when she threw in her mite; and provided the old lady had made any complaint of her tax, she would have been considered as a disorganizer, and sent to the house of correction; neither is it improbable that our Saviour was denounced as a stirrer up of sedition, for drawing any parallel between the widow and the rich men who accompanied her. At that day they held in small repute the taxes of the middling classes of citizens; they thought their aid in society was of but little consideration; without reflecting, that while others gave of their abundance, the poor man paid a greater proportion of his actual possessions.

These reflections naturally lead us to notice the observations made by those who oppose the repeal of the excise and other internal taxes. They say the rich pay them, and that the poor are not injured by their operation. While considering this question, we will not confine ourselves to the poor, in the idea generally affixed to this appellation; but we will, in connexion with them, bring into view the *middling interest*, consisting of farmers, tradesmen and labourers. When we offer these classes as the criterion on which to judge, we must conclude, that they pay more taxes by excise, than those generally denominated the rich; and though the high-toned federalists pretend to justify this mode of taxation, as falling exclusively on the wealthy, yet on an accurate examination we shall find they fall heavily on the poor and middling interest.

The excise, as it relates to many rich men, is principally on the consumption of such articles as they are called on to furnish more generally from inclination or accident, than necessity. For the most part, they are men who live on the income of their public stocks and bank dividends. The excise which they pay is either to

pleaſe their own appetites, or to entertain their bacchanalian aſſociates, on ſome peculiar feſtive occaſions. All they pay is a voluntary tax, and as the revenue is increaſed by the ſums raiſed on the community at large, they are enabled to receive their quarterly dividends with more punctuality. They are in favour of an exciſe upon a general principle, that if they pay 6*ſ.* duty in the courſe of the year, they are ſure of receiving from the treaſury the full intereſt on their funds at 20*ſ.*

But the caſe ſtands different with others, who may be denominated the middling intereſt. The farmer, in conſequence of an exciſe, is brought into an expenſe which is a direct tax on his produce, and which he cannot avoid. It is not merely to pleaſe his appetite, neither does he receive any immediate advantages reſulting from the revenue. The ſupplies of ſpirituous liquors to the workmen and labourers upon his farm, are an extra expenſe which he is *neceſſitated* to pay; every glaſs of liquor is burdened with a duty, which leſſens the profits on his produce. In haying-time, he is obliged to employ a great number of labourers; in the ſeveral buſy ſeaſons, he has a great addition to his family, and their maintenance includes many articles on which an exciſe is laid. In moſt inſtances, the farmer, by this mode of taxation, has to pay a larger amount to the government, than many men who have from one hundred thouſand to five hundred thouſand dollars in the public funds.

The caſe is ſomewhat ſimilar with the tradeſman, as he is obliged to employ many journeymen in his occupation, and wages are generally given in proportion to the prices on certain particular articles; the number of apprentices uſually taken by this claſs of citizens, involve in it a heavy tax from this ſpecies of revenue. Even the merchant is ſubject to a diſproportionate weight of government from this cauſe; as the employment of his clerks and labourers is attached with an expenſe ariſing from this ſource. The old ſoldier, who diſpoſed of the evidences of his patrioriſm during our conflict with Britain, moſt aſſuredly muſt feel the weight of a tax, which falls on the cheering cordial that refreſhes him amidſt the toils and fatigues of the day; his mite comes heavily, when he reflects that theſe are the rewards of his ſervices. He *now* drinks his grog with a merry heart, and bleſſes the adminiſtration that has removed the bitter ingredient of an exciſe.

When, therefore, we hear the federaliſts exclaiming that the *exciſe* was principally paid by the rich, and that it was an impoſition on the poor to repeal it, the fallacy of ſuch reaſoning is evident from a more accurate conſideration of the ſubject. For I believe we may venture to aſſert, that the middling intereſt, including the labouring poor, pay four times their juſt quota by this mode of taxation more than the richeſt claſſes in ſociety. Theſe ſmall duties are a conſtant draining from their hard-earned property, and though the rich apparently caſt into the treaſury much of their abundance, yet, like the poor widow, the farmer, tradeſman and labourer pay in "more than they all."

The repeal of the chaiſe and carriage-tax is alſo ſaid to be injurious to the middling intereſt. They tell us, that the rich nabobs at the ſouthward are the chief ſupporters of this tax, and that it is only relieving *them* by the repeal. But this reaſoning alſo is vanity. The proportion of carriages among the rich men of this deſcription, is ſcarcely one to an hundred. In this town, we have about fifty ſuch carriages, but through the ſtate, the number of chaiſes may be reckoned at five thouſand; theſe are generally kept by farmers and tradeſmen, not merely for convenience, but their local ſituation requires it; the diſtance from meeting-houſes in the country, obliges a man to keep this family-carriage to convey his wife and children to divine ſervice; to take a ride to the ſea-port on buſineſs; and probably to pay intereſt on a note in the bank, or in the hands of one of theſe rich men, who ſo greatly bemoan the repeal of the tax. A chaiſe therefore cannot be called a luxury, but a neceſſary article in moſt families in the country. To apply theſe remarks to my text, the duty on five thouſand carriages is a revenue which ariſes principally from the middling claſſes; and if they do not, like the widow, pay into the treaſury all they have, yet they caſt in more in proportion to the property they poſſeſs, than the fifty who appear to depoſit ſo largely from their abundance. Can any perſon think it reaſonable, that a hackman, whoſe carriage is his only means of maintenance, ſhould pay the ſame tax on this article as the man who keeps a pleaſurable-carriage, and has an income of ten thouſand dollars to ſupport it?

It is ſingular, that thoſe who ſtyle themſelves federaliſts ever pretend to be led by goſpel principles, and are ſo devout as to in-

corporate religion with their politics; they claim an exclusive character for attachment to the Christian system; yet there is no book extant, which so completely counteracts their political tenets. Our Saviour seemed to seek occasion to reprobate all those who made a trade of their piety; his sermon on the mount, and every remark he made, were peculiarly levelled at those bodies who exercised sovereignty over the people from their pre-eminent sanctity, or pretended to *render to Cæsar more than others.* Is it not remarkable, that our Saviour should espy a widow with her mite, amidst the crouds who surrounded the treasury; that he should call his disciples to him, and so minutely state the quantity she had given in; that he should over-look with indifference the large sums paid by the rich, and select a poor woman as the object of his notice, who was the least regarded by the money-holders who accompanied her? He did not make his observations indiscriminately to his audience; as he knew the prejudices of the people in favour of those who made great professions of their liberality towards religious and civil institutions; but he called his disciples *unto him*, and *privately* gave them a hint, to beware of hypocrites, and instilled into them, as a radical principle, that the poor or middling interest always paid their full proportion of the public taxes. This being a day to pay *into the treasury*, and having an opportunity to see the process of the business, he took occasion to give this lecture to his disciples; but if he had seen the group who probably the next day went to *receive their demands*, possibly, he would have been as particular in designating some individuals for the quantity they received, in proportion to the sum they had paid, as he was in describing the widow and her small pittance.

To conclude, the foregoing remarks are not intended to make an invidious distinction between the rich and the poor. In society the former are to be respected, and the latter regarded. A levelling principle is not the object contemplated, but that each individual should feel his just weight in the community. The observations are made to check the arrogance of a certain "sect," who pretend to claim an exclusive privilege from their property; who endeavour to depreciate those who are not possessed so largely of this world's goods as themselves; who claim all the religion, all the knowledge, all the patriotism of the country, and who despise

the poor, for their mite towards the support of government. But our Saviour has given them a good lesson, which the present administration is endeavouring to follow, and which we are persuaded will be approved by heaven. The impost being adequate to all the purposes of government, under the economical system adopted, the merchant, tradesman, farmer, war-worn soldier, or the poor widow, are not required *needlessly* to pay even a *mite* into the treasury.

No. LXXV.

REVIEW OF "OLD TIMES."

SEVENTY-FIVE, in the seventeenth century, is a prominent number in the American calendar; it is emphatically designated "the time which tried men's souls"; it is the period of the American revolution, which called forth all the energies of patriotism, valour and decision. The man who halted between two opinions, at this crisis, was justly considered an enemy to his country. America then assumed the attitude of an injured and determined nation. Britain avowed the principle, and pursued measures to carry into execution the detestable declaration, to "bind us in all cases whatever." This veto was attempted to be enforced by the *laws of the bayonet*, and the citizens of America had no other alternative than to decide between SLAVERY and FREEDOM.

In this contest, *liberty or death* was the motto—"Uniting we stand, dividing we fall," was the creed to which every real friend to his country subscribed. The *tories* took one side of the question, and the *whigs* the other; one party assisted the British, and the other opposed them. The Boston town-meetings were an epitome of the controversy between Britain and America. Fellow-citizens, ye who remember the contest, recollect the debates in your solemn assemblies; bring to mind the crouded audiences, who with anxious concern attended to the deliberations of your intrepid patriots. Can ye forget the machinations of your enemies or the subtle

deſigns of Hutchinſon and his adherents? Were not your liberties ſuſpended on the intrepidity of your determinations, and were not a body of tories aſſailing you in every direction? If you had *then* been afraid to eſpouſe your rights, they would have fallen a ſacrifice to your timidity. Recollect the *horn-book gentry*, who intermixed themſelves among the *ſons of liberty*; the ſoldiery who were ſent to intimidate the citizens during their freedom of debate and inveſtigation. Our ſouls were then "invigorated with the ſpirit of liberty;" *Faneuil-Hall* bore teſtimony that men were ſuperior to "wolves"; the deciſions of the town of Boſton gave ample evidence that the liberty of brutes, and the unalienable rights of freemen, were not analogous. No *real* American at this period contemplated the derogatory connexion between the voracious animals of the deſert, and the deliberate ſentiments of citizens. Even at this period, when the revolution of America was in ſwaddling clothes, when the independence of our country had ſcarcely formed its features in embryo, no one was hardy enough to draw a parallel between *our exertions for liberty*, and the *ſavage diſpoſition* of wolves in the foreſt!

This period reminds us of that ſanguinary ſcene, when the ſtreets of Boſton were crimſoned with the blood of its citizens! The horrid maſſacre on the night of *March the 5th*, 1770, is a leſſon which ought to impreſs on the minds of Americans the hoſtile diſpoſition of Britain. Can any friendſhip exiſt in a nation, whoſe ſoldiery ſpread indiſcriminate ſlaughter among the inhabitants of this metropolis? Can the *old whigs* forget the diſtreſſing ſcene when the corps of five of their fellow-citizens were followed in ſolemn proceſſion through the ſtreets of Boſton? When the *tories* were rejoicing at the ſanguinary cataſtrophe, and only bewailed the misfortune that Samuel Adams and John Hancock were not the objects of general lamentation. The *whigs* well remember the town-meeting at the *Old-South* the ſucceeding day; the aſſembly of citizens was auguſt and impreſſive; the debates were forcible and deciſive; the energies of the inhabitants appeared in their full majeſty; one ſpirit invigorated the whole body, and one tongue expreſſed their ultimate determination. Can we forget the venerable SAMUEL ADAMS on this ſolemn occaſion? Can we forget the fortitude of his mind, or the magnanimity of

his conduct? Do we not even at this day recognize him in the *Old-South pulpit*, while ſtanding as a bulwark to impede the encroachments of the enemy? "How did our hearts burn within us," when he recounted the impoſitions we had ſuffered! and how did our ſouls beat in uniſon with the ſentiments which he inculcated! This was truly the "*time to try men's ſouls.*" VENERABLE PATRIOT! you are now retired from the world to enjoy that compoſure which your ſervices merit; happy are you in the reflection, that you have never deviated from the road which you early deſcribed as the only path of ſafety and happineſs. In your retirement, you have to lament, that *ſome* who began the journey with you have ſtrayed into the broad way which leads to deſtruction; but ſtill your reflections muſt give conſolation to your declining years; and though feeble in body, yet your SOUL muſt experience thoſe joys which are ever ſtrangers to the breaſts of apoſtates. While others have received the ſycophantic addreſſes of men, who in '75 would have led them to the gibbet, you have enjoyed domeſtic tranquillity, and have had the ſatisfaction to reflect, if you was not *flattered*, you was not *deſpiſed*; you never became the *dupe* of a party, or the ſport of thoſe who made an inſtrument of your credulity;—firm, manly and deciſive, you never was obliged to apologize for your conduct, by laying the blame on thoſe who preſumed to dictate through an "expected or unexpected quarter." No—you was a politician equal to your emergencies, and certainly you was placed in a reſponſible ſituation, when the moſt critical precaution was neceſſary for your judgment. When the *proſcription of Britain* entwined YOU and HANCOCK as victims to ſatiate their vengeance, even at this momentous criſis, ADAMS and HANCOCK never ſtooped to become ſuppliants for miniſterial or tory clemency. Your fellow-citizens, *venerable patriot*, will ever embalm your memory with their praiſe, and your name will never be mentioned without reverting to the magnitude of your virtues, and the pre-eminent teſtimonies you have given of your unbiaſſed attachment to their freedom and happineſs. YOU HAVE DONE YOUR DUTY, AND NO MAN CAN IMPEACH YOUR FIDELITY.

In this Number, I have choſen to ſelect among the variety of circumſtances attending the revolution, the *Boſton maſſacre*. This was the touchſtone of the Engliſh ſyſtem of taxation. After the troops had arrived in Boſton, every method was taken to bring on

a rupture; they found town-meeting altercations were needleſs; their only reſort was, *to arms* and *the ſhedding of blood!* The tories always held up to the miniſtry, that we were poltroons, and that the firſt man killed would end the controverſy. The *fifth of March maſſacre* was planned upon this derogatory ſuppoſition; the miniſtry expected, after they had diſplayed their proweſs and evinced their determination, that the citizens of America would have been intimidated from any further oppoſition; but when they found that the blood of the Americans operated like oil to the flame, they became diſmayed. The firmneſs of the town of Boſton on this occaſion, was the baſis of the revolution; this was the trial of principle; this was putting theory into practice. The conduct of Britain was bringing our town-meeting reſolves to the teſt, and this was the period when the republicans gave an unequivocal evidence of their patriotiſm. The *tradeſmen* of Boſton were alert to the cauſe of their country; they gave ſupport to the active citizens who pledged their lives and fortunes in vindication of the rights of the people; they were an irreſiſtible body, and when *they* moved within the orbit of freedom and roſe ſuperior to tory influence, all oppoſition fell before them. The *tradeſmen* were fully informed of the importance of the controverſy, and when they ſpoke, their voice was audible and deciſive. The *independent merchants* were not inactive, as we were not baffled at this period with a body of mercantile muſhrooms, who live on the ſmiles of a *Britiſh maſter*, and who *dare not act* contrary to his dictates. The YEOMANRY alſo came forward to vindicate their rights as freemen; this valuable part of the community never failed when their exertions were neceſſary; on this independent body we ever did, and ever muſt rely; they are the ſtamina of our government, and the great palladium of our conſtitutional privileges. The counties of *Middleſex* and *Norfolk*, with others, ſtill retain the horrors of a Britiſh banditti, as they well remember the ſanguinary onſet of a mercenary ſoldiery on the commencement of hoſtilities. The 19TH OF APRIL, 1775, will impreſs on their minds the dreadful effects of monarchy and toryiſm. *Lexington* was a *telegraph*, which conveyed the intelligence to the remoteſt parts of the continent—like the *ſtar in the eaſt*, mentioned in ſcripture, it directed Waſhington to the ſpot, where the camp of America was formed, to effect the ſalvation of freemen. From this moment the Americans were

alive to their ſituation, and nothing ſhort of heaven could have inſpired them with their martial intrepidity, valour and proweſs; unprepared with every warlike implement, they were obliged to ſeek powder from the very earth under their ancient buildings, and, like the duſt of Egypt by the wand of Aaron, it was converted to the purpoſe of annoying and diſtreſſing their enemies.

I have particularly ſelected, as is before obſerved, the ſubject of the *Boſton maſſacre*. When this took place, the controverſy in this country involved in it the right of the Britiſh government to tax America; they ſent troops to enforce it. In this ſtate of things, could any patriot juſtify, for a *trifling fee*, the indiſcriminate ſlaughter of his fellow-citizens, merely from the unruly conduct of a number of boys? Edward Paine, Eſq. a worthy citizen, was wounded at his door, and every man, woman and child were more protected by Providence, than the lenity of the murderers.

I would not dwell too long on this circumſtance, relating to the *advocate* for Preſton, as I believe the ſuggeſtion is ſufficient to convince him of the impropriety of his conduct. Whether the main guard of Britiſh troops ſhould diſpenſe the laws, in a country where their *whole authority was diſputed*, was the queſtion on which Preſton and his aſſociates ought to have been tried.

The controverſy had gone beyond the trifling conſideration of a lawyer's fee; the important queſtion of civil and military boundary was to be aſcertained, and when a patriot became the advocate for a prompt deciſion of powder and ball (without even the formality of a juſtice of the peace) the Britiſh naturally concluded that a few guineas would ſilence our clamours, and bring our leading characters to juſtify their meaſures.

The political ſtate of our country requires us to look back, in order to take ſome line of departure, by which we may draw our deciſions. The fifth of March maſſacre, in my opinion, is the era which decided characters, within the town of Boſton, in the eſtimation of Britain. They never forgave Samuel Adams or John Hancock for inſiſting on the removal of the troops; Engliſh pride roſe indignant at the action; this was the unpardonable ſin, which led to their proſcription—but while they thirſted for the blood of theſe patriots, gratitude ever induced them to reſpect thoſe who countenanced a venal court to releaſe the murderers. At this

moment, the hand-writing was discovered "*Mene Tekel Upharsin,*" which is thus interpreted,—he who vindicates the murderers of his townsmen is found wanting in patriotism.

The following pieces were written, in the year 1797, *by the same author ;—and as they contain principles and documents connected with the foregoing Numbers, they are inserted for the perusal of the citizens.*

LAND-TAX, &c.

THE statement of the treasury-department, for further supplies of revenue, is a subject which could scarcely be contemplated a few years back. The IMPOST was, in the first instance, considered as adequate to all the exigences of government ; and in fact was declared so vastly competent to all the purposes, that a declaration was made by secretary Hamilton that an overplus remained in the treasury. Notwithstanding this pleasing representation, we were soon called upon for an EXCISE, which was predicated on the principle that the WAR-DEPARTMENT required this additional duty. These two taxes have been for many years in full operation, and though we have been told of the "flourishing situation of our commerce," (of consequence the revenue arising must have been greatly augmented) yet, even with this brilliant prospect of a *decrease of taxation*, we have now presented to us a gloomy statement, that the revenue is incompetent to our governmental demands. A LAND-TAX is now the resort, and is to become the medium for further supplies. The merchant and tradesman have hitherto experienced largely the demands of government ; and the FARMER is now to be brought forward to assist the revenue. Though the yeomanry have heretofore in an indirect way bore their proportion of the weight of impost and excise, yet they are now called upon for an immediate taxation on their lands.

It is poſſible that the neceſſities of our government may require an increaſe of revenue, but we certainly ought to know by what fatality, we are reduced to this neceſſity. We ought to be informed of the expenditures, and through what channels the exceſs of duties have been abſorbed. If the departments of government have hitherto been too laviſh of the public money: If the WAR DEPARTMENT has ſunk millions, by "miſ-management and neglect:" If the BRITISH TREATY brings into view a large debt to be diſcharged by the United States: If the building of frigates, will abſorb millions to complete them: If we have hitherto been laviſh in conſequence of the facility of collecting the revenue:— If theſe things are true, it is proper that the people ſhould be made acquainted with theſe circumſtances, before they reſign the great ſtamina of Taxation, the LANDS of the United States.

No individual within the United States ever conceived that the ſubject of a LAND-TAX would have been before Congreſs at ſo early a period after the adoption of the federal conſtitution. We have often heard that we were *leſſening* our debts; that the revenue was adequate; and the "flouriſhing ſtate of our commerce," gave vigour to theſe happy ideas. But theſe luminous proſpects have become clouded, and the citizens, in a *time of peace*, are reduced in their financiering arrangements, to a WAR eſtabliſhment.

Congreſs it is expected will conſider with attention this new revenue propoſition; for if the landed property is once touched, the future ſyſtem of finance is opened upon an extenſive ſcale; when this reſource (which was ever conſidered the laſt) is broke in upon, in a *time of peace*, and ſhould the United States be hereafter engaged in a war, the extent of its operation, and the yearly increaſe of tax on this ſource, will reduce the country to a ſtate, but little ſhort of the moſt ſervile nation in Europe.

If, within a few years, we have gone ſo greatly beyond our reſources of impoſt and exciſe; if we have become ſo laviſh on theſe two objects, as to expend all the production from them, have we not reaſon to ſuppoſe that the call for ONE MILLION, FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS on the land will be as quickly expended? When the government can once *ſtep* this *hobby-horſe*, with a weight of *one penny* on an acre, they will ſoon make it *trot* with a weight of *twenty ſhillings*.

ECONOMY in our expenditures is the great object of attention. Commerce is already burthened. Manufactures are in general either ruined or embarraſſed. The revenue ariſing from impoſt and exciſe, (eſpecially the laſt two years) it is probable would have been adequate to our purpoſes, if the money had been *economically* appropriated. But when we find, that the expenditures in thoſe tranſactions which immediately come within our knowledge, are laviſhed to an unparrelleled exceſs, we have reaſon to ſuſpect that *economy* has not been the ſtandard of our conduct.

The building of our three frigates, it is expected, will coſt more money than three times the ſame number in any part of Europe. This buſineſs may ſerve to put ſome men in pay, who otherways would be out of employ; it may ſerve to give excluſive advantages to individuals in furniſhing the manufacturing materials; it may conduce to political purpoſes, by employing particular men in all the lucrative parts of this naval tranſaction. But if it is *abſolutely neceſſary* that we ſhould have a navy, of THREE frigates, the buſineſs ſhould be ſo equally proportioned, that no one individual ſhould monopolize in his *manufacturing department*, the advantages of it.

Congreſs, previous to their granting a land-tax, it is preſumed, will call for official documents, to aſcertain preciſely the expenditures of the enormous ſum raiſed by impoſt and exciſe, and will not haſtily break in upon the dernier reſort of TERRA FIRMA, till "The People" are convinced of the propriety, neceſſity and *economy* of the meaſure.

FREE SHIPS, FREE GOODS.

Fellow-Citizens,

THE diſpute between France and this country has got ſo far involved in perplexity, that the real objects of controverſy are almoſt thrown out of public view.

The cauſe of complaint is ſimply this, the treaty which the United States have made with France, has ſecured to us the im-

portant privilege of the CARRYING-TRADE, by making free ships free goods. By this treaty, the commerce of this country, as it respects that nation, has the most ample security for a *free trade*, even in time of war. The great difficulty, then, arising between France and this country, is, that by the British treaty *we have expressly stipulated with England* that free ships *shall not* make free goods.

In consequence of this stipulation, the *French property* on board American ships is subject to capture by the British, while the *English property* on board American ships is to remain free and unmolested. France complains of this inequality of privilege, more especially as this is admitted, *on our part*, by an express agreement in the treaty with England.

Let then the Americans judge with respect to the propriety and justness of this partiality. I am sensible, that the plea made by the advocates for the British treaty is, that England never acknowledged the principle, and never would accede to the terms of admitting free ships to make free goods. But though this observation may be plead by Britain, yet the question naturally arises, whether it was good faith in the government of the United States *voluntarily* to make a treaty with England, in direct opposition to the principle on which their treaties with France and Spain were founded? If Britain would not consent to the freedom of our navigation, was it politic or generous in us to grant them *by treaty* the *right* to capture the property of those who had generously acceded to the principle?

Suppose two men had made an agreement to give *free course* to the trade of each other, and a third was so refractory as never to consent to it. In this case, would it not be the highest violation of the right of one, if the other should enter *voluntarily into an agreement* with him who would not recognize the privilege, to check and embarrass the trade of the man with whom he had made his first covenant?

The controversy with France and the United States stands on the same ground of equity. It is true, that nation does not dispute the *right of England*, in not agreeing that free ships should make free goods; neither do they dispute *our right* to make a treaty with them, for this purpose. But at the same time, while

the *right* is acknowledged on our ſide, if we improve it to their injury, *they alſo have a right* to reſent our ingratitude and duplicity. If we have inconſiderately and wantonly exerciſed our right in making a treaty with their implacable enemies, and thereby given them advantages which deſtroy the *mutual benefits* contemplated in our former contract, they have the ſame right to reſent our conduct as we have to make a treaty with Britain to their injury.

The people of America have been deceived by the frequent attempts to perſuade them, that France wiſhes to interfere in our right to make treaties. This, however, is falſe. France has never denied us this right. But if we are ſo imprudent as to make a treaty, which ſubjects French property to be taken on board American veſſels, when at the ſame time, they are under engagements to us, that Engliſh property ſhall be ſecure in ſuch bottoms, the operation becomes ſo exceſſively unjuſt, that we cannot reaſonably ſuppoſe any nation would tamely place themſelves in ſuch a derogatory and unfavourable ſituation.

Nations, like individuals, will ſecure themſelves againſt injuſtice; and the only queſtion is, whether the French are wrong *in their reſentment*, or we *in giving them the provocation?*

I have endeavoured to give a *plain ſtatement* of what appears to be one of the eſſential points of controverſy, between France and the United States. The merchants are left to judge of the benefits of a war with thoſe powers, which wiſh to ſupport the Carrying Trade of the United States in alliance with one which is anxious to annihilate it.

If a war ſhould commence between France and Spain, and America, what are the proſpects of our merchants? Are they willing to join England in this warfare, who are anxious to deſtroy our Carrying Trade? Impoſſible that the good ſenſe of the American merchants ſhould lead them to this exceſs of Quixotiſm and individual ruin.

A war with France and Spain is no leſs than a war upon our own commerce. It is commercial ſuicide; and provided the Eſſex junto are capable of deceiving the merchants into a compliance with their projects, the only ſatisfaction they can receive, after the

expenditures of their property, and the ruin of their trade, will be the ridicule of thoſe who are living on the ſmiles and favoritiſm of a Britiſh party reſiding in this country.

ON FOREIGN INFLUENCE.

"*Let us not be Engliſhmen, nor Frenchmen, but* AMERICANS."

IN my laſt, a few obſervations were made on this *convenient ſaying*, of certain *time-ſerving* ſycophants. I therein endeavoured to prove that we did not act as *Americans* on the queſtion of the treaty, but were wholly under a *Britiſh influence*, in acceding (contrary to our previous reſolutions) to this baneful and deſtructive inſtrument.

I ſhall now conſider this ſubject upon more general principles, and attempt to ſhew, that *Britiſh influence* pervades this country in a more extenſive manner than is generally apprehended.

When we reflect on the number of Britiſh factors who reſide within the United States—the number of individuals who were enemies to our revolution, and ſince the peace returned among us—the number of perſons who reſided in America during our conteſt with Britain, and who were inimical to our independence—the particular body of merchants, who receive their annual ſupplies of merchandize from the Engliſh merchants and manufacturers—the ſhopkeepers in the country who are vending theſe ſuperfluities in the ſeveral towns throughout the United States—the faſhions and manners which we imbibe from our Britiſh connexions: I would candidly aſk, whether all theſe circumſtances do not ſerve to prove that we are under the influence of the *Britiſh nation*, by the various operations of theſe reſpective intereſts? I dare venture to aſſert that there is not a man who contemplates the ſubject upon fair and rational principles, but will readily allow, that the influence of the *Britiſh* predominates in this country from theſe reſpective cauſes, and that no other *foreign influence* is half ſo powerful.

I will again inquire with confidence, whether any man can ſuppoſe we are under a *French influence*, ſtrong enough to oppoſe this powerful combination in favour of Britain? Look through our ſeaports and the inland trading towns, and who are the perſons active in our political concerns? Are they *French* or *Britiſh* merchants? What ſpecies of merchandize are in their ſtores or ſhops? Whoſe faſhions do we follow, or whoſe manners do we adopt; are they *French* or *Engliſh?* Even our theatrical entertainments are announced as being acted at Covent-Garden or Drury-Lane, to give a zeſt to the performance, and we are led to ſupport them in proportion as they have received their plaudit at thoſe ROYAL places of amuſement. Let the revilers againſt French influence produce the channels through which it operates; let them name the body of French merchants, reſiding in the metropolis or inland towns; let them announce the immenſe "horde" of French republicans reſiding among us. We can then judge whether they are in proportion to the numerous clan of Britiſh ariſtocrats, and men who are *openly in favour* of the monarchy of Britain. Let them produce the body of Frenchmen who are active in our elections in any degree equal to thoſe of the Britiſh: In ſhort, let them mention any particular as it relates to *foreign influence*, and it can be proved that the *Engliſh nation* poſſeſs, and practice it in a fourfold ratio.

After ſuch demonſtrations of the predilection of certain perſons to Britain; after being convinced that *Britiſh attachments* both in *trade* and in *political ſentiments* ſo greatly predominate, can we ſeriouſly ſay, that *French influence* prevails within the United States? On the contrary, is it not evident, that *Britiſh influence* has an uncontrolable ſway? Scarcely a HAT (not a *three-cornered one*) which covers the head of an American, but what announces our connexion with their merchants; and the fantaſtic gewgaws of many of our ladies are the trophies which proclaim our complete reſignation to their faſhionable influence. The American ladies whoſe graces and beauty riſe ſuperior to any ornaments from Europe, ought to ſpurn at the idea of becoming ſubſervient to the paltry trumpery of foreign importations.

The manufactures of America are daily falling a ſacrifice to our partiality for Britain; while the Britiſh manufacturer is in-

creaſing in wealth by our importations, the American manufacturer is declining with equal rapidity; do not our importations operate as a *prohibition* on our own manufactures, and does not the reſidence of Britiſh factors give a ſuperiority over our own merchants?

While we are talking of foreign influence, let us reflect on our connexion with England. Let us contemplate the numerous avenues by which this is conveyed. It works in every direction, and ſtrengthens in almoſt every connexion. I would again aſk, wherein have the *French* an equal weight? Let thoſe who are exclaiming againſt them, produce the evidences of *their* influence; or let them ſhow any circumſtance, which can in any way counteract the forcible operation of the Britiſh, not only in their *commercial intercourſe*, but in the efficacy of thoſe inſidious arts practiſed by a phalanx of Britiſh factors, who reſide among us under a deceptive maſk of naturalization.

To ſum up the whole in a few words, the *Britiſh influence* has become a ſtrong and powerful ingredient to poiſon the republican principles of our citizens, and while they are employing their *tools* to cry down a *French influence*, they are uſing every baſe art to effect their own. They know their force in ſeveral parts of the United States, and are buſily employed to vilify and abuſe every character who attempts to diſcloſe their nefarious meaſures. Not that I am in favour of a French influence, but would control it in every inſtance; my real ſentiments are, let us be AMERICANS in DEED and in TRUTH.

CONCLUDING ADDRESS.

[*Never before published.*]

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

AFTER perusing the foregoing Numbers, you will be led to consider the propriety of the principles, and the justness of the reflections.—Here then we are at issue. ARE THE SENTIMENTS RIGHT, OR ARE THEY WRONG? Speak with candour, and decide with that impartiality which characterizes patriots and republicans.

To the YOUNG Americans the foregoing remarks may appear erroneous. They have risen on the stage since the fig-tree began to blossom, and fruit was on the vine; since the labour of the olive has not failed, and the fields have yielded their meat; when the flock was not cut off from the fold, and there was herd in the stall. In these halcyon days, they experience the blessings which *their fathers* obtained by their prowess and exertions.

The question now is, by what means has this country arrived to its present eminence? Was it by the friendship of that nation which declared they had a "right to tax us in all cases whatever"? Did the ravages of their troops give fruitfulness to our fields, or did the blood they shed enrich the soil which feeds the cattle on our "thousand hills"?

I will not affront my countrymen by admitting this idea. If we had been conquered, the wilderness that now blossoms like the rose, would have been the gloomy asylum of persecuted patriots; and these venerable sages would have been hunted in their retirement as partaking of the ferocious liberty of wolves.

Is it policy then, or rather is it not an affront to heaven, to seek an alliance with those who have given such evidences of their enmity? Must we commence war with France and Spain, and then apply to England for assistance, as is proposed by Mr. Morris? Gracious God! "let us pause! for heaven's sake pause!"

before we precipitate the United States into ſo hazardous a ſituation! Muſt our country again be ſtained with blood? Muſt the clarion of war be blown through the continent? Muſt millions of dollars be appropriated to effect that, which an amicable negociation will probably cancel? Surely the Preſident has acted the part of a Chriſtian by attempting a reconciliation: for he who wantonly draws the ſword, we are told, will periſh by the ſword. Not that we ſhould ſuffer *any nation* to impoſe on us; but reaſon and humanity dictate the path to be taken.

A war with France and Spain, in alliance with England, is the ground-work of the politics of the party in oppoſition to the preſent adminiſtration. They have, by their artifice, interwoven themſelves for a number of years back into our national councils, and the principal part of our troubles have ariſen by their agency. They wiſh to augment the public debt, by eſtabliſhing ſyſtems which lead to extravagant expenditures. They want the government to maintain a body of men at the expenſe of the induſtrious merchant, farmer, and tradeſman.—This is *genuine federaliſm* with them, and every thing which has a different tendency is reprobated as *rank jacobiniſm*.

Are the YOUNG MEN in favour of this policy? If they are, it muſt eventually prove their ruin. An expenſive government creates burdenſome taxes, and the riſing generation muſt feel the weight of their preſſure.

This party attempt ſo far to vitiate the youth, as to render republicaniſm unfaſhionable. This is ſtriking at the vitals of our government; for the man who is not a republican is a POLITICAL ATHEIST, and is as much a ſubverter of the Conſtitution as Thomas Paine is an unbeliever in Revelation. All our civil inſtitutions, from the days of our forefathers, are as firmly founded on Republicaniſm, as the platform of the churches on the Chriſtian religion.

The foregoing obſervations are not intended to *inflame* the paſſions, but to *allay* them; though expreſſed with *warmth*, they are calculated to bring us to *cool* reflection. In the preſent ſtate of public affairs, it is requiſite to bring into view the many arts and ſtratagems practiſed by thoſe who aſſume the appellation of Federaliſts, and to ſhew that all their alarms were the effuſions of diſaffection, rather than an attachment to the peace and proſperity of

the country. While we revert to the periods when plots and conſpiracies were the telegraphs to communicate terror and amazement, and when neighbours aſſumed an hoſtile attitude towards each other, how pleaſing is the reflection that the cool moment of deliberation has diſpelled thoſe clouds which threatened an annihilation of every benign attribute which harmonizes ſociety! If we find theſe things falſe, (which at the time they were propagated gave an impulſe to our political conduct) ought we not to diſtruſt thoſe men who create alarms to deſtroy the confidence of the people in the preſent adminiſtration? If they have hitherto been falſe prophets, what reaſon have we to believe in their future prognoſtications?

Fellow-Citizens—In treating on the various ſubjects in the foregoing Numbers, I have been obliged to vary the mode by argument and ſatire. Many things have required a ſerious conſideration, while others admitted no other plea than ridicule. I have wholly confined my obſervations to political conſiderations, without wiſhing to reflect on any individual in his moral or ſocial capacity. The GENERAL GOOD is my only object, and I willingly place myſelf on the candid deciſions of my fellow-citizens. I court no *partial patronage*. Having offered my ſentiments on the fundamental principles of the Conſtitution, it will give me ſatisfaction as a citizen if they are ſupported; but if they are not, I feel myſelf in a ſituation to meet the evils which await my country. Provided I receive the approbation of the virtuous and patriotic, I ſhall never concern myſelf about perſons of an oppoſite character;

> *"To virtue only, and its friends, a friend,*
> *The world beſide may murmur or commend:*
> *Know all the diſtant din this world can keep,*
> *Rolls o'er my grotto, and but ſoothes my ſleep."*

FINIS.

JK
2317
1803
A85

Austin, Benjamin
Constitutional
republicanism

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY